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The meeting was called to order at 3:45 p.m.

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENT(S) OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. **Mr. VIUICI** (Italy) said that one of the basic questions to be tackled was the adequacy of the existing multilateral disarmament machinery. His delegation shared the view that effective multilateral forums for the consideration and negotiation of arms limitation and disarmament measures were of great importance to counter and reverse the ever-expanding arms race. A good negotiating structure was admittedly no substitute for political will, but the latter could be stimulated by better understanding resulting from constructive dialogue in an appropriate body. In its latest proposal for a comprehensive disarmament programme, his delegation had emphasized that, although nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States bore a special responsibility in the disarmament process, all nations had a vital interest in the outcome of disarmament negotiations. Consequently, the active participation and support of all States was required. His Government therefore considered the General Assembly to be the most qualified forum to consider the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and was ready to support any constructive step which could strengthen the role of the United Nations and implement the relevant provisions of the Charter.

2. The special session would be a suitable occasion for the Security Council to review its achievements in regulating armaments in accordance with Article 26 of the Charter. It might also consider the establishment, under Article 29 of the Charter, of subsidiary organs for specific disarmament purposes, starting with a committee to control the international transfer of conventional weapons which would be divided into regional sub-committees. An international organ could also be established to supervise the application of disarmament agreements.

3. The range and complexity of disarmament issues made an effective negotiating body essential, and CCD, despite some unavoidable shortcomings, had undeniably played a significant part in the elaboration of most of the treaties concluded thus far and had acquired considerable skill and experience. It should therefore continue to function as the main multilateral negotiating body for disarmament measures. Although it had been suggested that CCD might be enlarged in order to ensure a better geographical and political representation of Member States, his Government was convinced that a restricted forum was essential to ensure businesslike negotiations. While it would not oppose a small increase in the membership of CCD, it maintained that the principle of selected membership should be respected, and that in recruiting new members, careful attention should be paid to their ability to make a consistent contribution to disarmament negotiations. Consideration might also be given to the possibility of opening the meetings of CCD to other interested Members of the United Nations. While some Governments had recommended strengthening the link between CCD and others had recommended incorporating CCD into the United Nations structure, his delegation considered that CCD should preserve a degree of autonomy and flexibility, although the General Assembly might be called up to give broader guidance to disarmament negotiations. The principle of consensus must be maintained in all deliberations involving so vital an issue as the security of individual nations. To achieve closer liaison /...
between CCD and the General Assembly, CCD might be asked to send the Assembly a periodic progress report after the spring session, together with special reports on particular topics. At the beginning of its annual activities, CCD should seek to plan its negotiating work for the spring and summer sessions. It could also set up functional working groups to negotiate draft treaties or to consider specific items. In addition, steps could be taken to facilitate the presence in CCD of the nuclear-weapon States which currently did not participate in its deliberations.

4. His delegation was anxious to end the stalemate between those Members of the United Nations wishing to preserve the current CCD co-chairmanship and those seeking to replace it by the principle of rotation. However, little progress had been achieved thus far, and his delegation’s views on the matter had therefore been omitted from its working paper on international mechanisms for disarmament, to be circulated shortly. It was, however, hoped that a compromise solution could be found.

5. Mr. DENG (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that the past and present activities of UNESCO in the field of disarmament had already been described to the Committee at its third session in September 1977, and in UNESCO’s contribution to the 1977 United Nations Disarmament Yearbook. However, the Committee should be informed about UNESCO’s most recent activities.

6. At its eleventh session, the General Conference of UNESCO had defined as one of its essential tasks the creation of a climate of public opinion favourable to the attainment of the disarmament objectives set by the United Nations. At the seventeenth session, a decision had been taken to mobilize public opinion in favour of disarmament by more intensive use of the mass media and the encouragement of relevant activities by non-governmental organizations. At its eighteenth session, the General Conference had adopted an intersectoral programme on human rights and peace, intended inter alia to promote education on disarmament problems.

7. Among its current activities, the General Conference at its nineteenth session, in 1976, had adopted resolution 13.1, which stated that UNESCO by virtue of its experience and its world-wide authority, could and should make an effective contribution to the problem by generating a climate of public opinion conducive to the halting of the arms race. Relevant articles on disarmament were disseminated by means of UNESCO publications, and the Director-General had been asked to conduct some preliminary work on disarmament research, bearing particularly on illiteracy and cultural progress, and to plan for future symposia on disarmament topics for educators, scientists and cultural workers. At its nineteenth session, the General Conference had also approved the medium-term plan for 1977-1982, which included a number of objectives relating to the strengthening of peace. In 1977, UNESCO had intensified its activities in the field of disarmament in order to contribute to the preparation of the special session of the General Assembly. The report submitted to the Committee in September 1977 had indicated current UNESCO activities likely to make a particular contribution to the special session: the publication of a document on the role of the international organizations in disarmament; radio programmes; the publication of a brochure containing articles /...
on disarmament topics; two annotated bibliographies and a study of recent trends in research on the social and economic aspects of the arms race; a world survey of disarmament education; and a study of the pedagogical aspects of disarmament education.

8. A meeting of experts on obstacles to disarmament had been held at UNESCO headquarters from 3 to 7 April 1978 and had been attended by experts from Cameroon, Colombia, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, India, Ireland, Norway, Poland, Romania, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States. The experts had concluded that the peoples of the world had a key role to play in creating the social and cultural conditions, the political climate and the will on the part of States needed for progress towards disarmament. They had also concluded that the special session should recognize the existence of a human right to a disarmed world as an essential corollary to the right to development and the right to peace. They had stated that there was a need to develop the study of disarmament law as an integral part of international law. The inclusion of a reference to disarmament law in the preamble and declaration of the final document of the special session would stimulate study of the topic by lawyers, scholars and governmental and non-governmental organizations. In order to promote a favourable climate of public opinion, the programme of action should be addressed not only to Member States, but also to international organizations such as UNESCO, which were well equipped to influence those aspects of disarmament that were related to education and culture. The experts had therefore requested UNESCO, as provided in the draft programme and budget for 1979-1980, to give special emphasis to the development of education for disarmament. However, special recommendations in the programme of action of the special session would help to intensify the efforts already being made by UNESCO in the field of disarmament. In its draft programme for 1979-1980, UNESCO was planning an international congress on education for disarmament. It hoped that the special session would recommend the continuation of its activities in fostering a favourable climate for disarmament, which in fact was rooted in the disarming of men's minds. The constitution of UNESCO stated that peace must be based on the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind, and not exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of Governments.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

9. The CHAIRMAN reminded members of the Preparatory Committee that a decision was still pending on the Mexican proposal to publish all the relevant documentation prepared for the Committee's work in an annex or annexes to its final report. A statement on the financial implications was before the Committee in Conference Room Paper 17.

10. Dr. FISHER (United States of America) said that, if a consensus should emerge to adopt the Mexican proposal, his delegation would have no objection. However, personally, he believed that to produce an annex as lengthy as 2,000 pages would be a sure way of keeping the material secret; no one would read it. Presumably, any request for appropriation would have to be submitted to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Although there was provision in General Assembly resolution 32/214 for unforeseen and extraordinary expenses, he did
not believe that supplementary appropriations for the special session came into that category. The expenditure should be absorbed within existing appropriations for the biennium, even though the need to have the documents printed outside would make that difficult.

11. Mr. Barton (Canada) said that he found it somewhat difficult to accept the idea contained in Conference Room Paper 17 that the proposed annex should be circulated before it was ready in all six languages. If the Arabic version was not ready in time, he would prefer to see the final report circulated in all official languages and then all language versions of the annex circulated simultaneously at a later stage.

12. The Chair said that it was only the Arabic language version which posed certain practical problems, but he understood that every effort would be made to have all the documents ready in Arabic as soon as possible. There was no question that all documentation would have to be made available in all six languages.

13. Mr. Baruni (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the second paragraph of Conference Room Paper 17 stated clearly that the documentation should be reproduced in six languages and he could not understand why Arabic had been singled out in the statement of financial implications, since the problems involved were practical rather than financial. His delegation would like to make it known that there could not be a special session without documentation and interpretation in all six languages. The Preparatory Committee could not advise or recommend the General Assembly or its subsidiary bodies to take measures which would be in violation of General Assembly resolutions which called for all documents to be made available in all official languages. Extraneous considerations could not be taken into account and the Department of Conference Services should be prevailed upon, in the few weeks remaining before the special session, to do its utmost to have the documentation translated and made available in all languages. He supported the view expressed by the representative of Canada that documents should be distributed simultaneously in all languages.

14. Mr. Sokalski (Poland) said it was sometimes difficult to be consistent, but the Preparatory Committee should bear in mind General Assembly resolution 2837 (XXVI) which, in its annex II, paragraph 107 (c), stated that "as a rule, no previously issued material should be incorporated in or appended to reports".

15. His delegation would only agree to support the Mexican proposal on the understanding that any expenditure would be absorbed within existing appropriations.

16. Mr. Kubba (Iraq) stated that the problem of the Arabic language version was a separate question. It seemed that the Secretariat did not consider Arabic as an official language, otherwise, the work would already have been put in hand. He appreciated the suggestion made by the representative of Canada regarding document distribution.

17. Mr. Harry (Australia) said that, since the material produced in connexion with the activities of the Preparatory Committee had not been made available for general distribution, it was important that the basic documentation should be provided for

/...
all member States before or during the special session. It was assumed that
documentation would be available in all languages, even if some of the earlier
documentation, for reasons beyond the control of the Secretariat, could not be made
available in Arabic. He wondered if it had been intended to include the three	tabulations drawn up by the Secretariat. It might be possible to save some money
by omitting them, since they were of a somewhat transitory nature.

16. The CHAIRMAN said it was his impression that the three tabulations were to be
included. Due note would be taken of the comments made regarding the preparation of
documentation in Arabic. As Conference Room Paper 17 made clear, the Secretariat
would do everything possible to make the Arabic documentation available in time for
the special session. If, for lack of time, that proved to be impossible, it would
be circulated at a later stage as soon as it was available. He pointed out that
the Secretariat was not able to state at the current stage whether the expenditure
could be absorbed or not, but if it proved necessary to request supplementary
appropriations, that would be done through the competent bodies. If there
were no objections, he would take it that the Committee decided to annex the
documentation to its final report in all six official languages.

19. It was so decided.

20. Ir. KUBBA (Iraq) said he hoped that the Chairman's remarks with regard to the
preparation of the documentation in Arabic would be included in the decision.

21. The CHAIRMAN announced that the draft of the introduction to the final
document, which he had prepared, would be circulated the following day. It was
non-controversial and he hoped that it would be possible to adopt it for inclusion
in the final report, subject to any necessary amendments. On the question of
non-governmental organizations and research institutes, the officers were requesting
some additional information and hoped to be able to make a recommendation to the
Preparatory Committee at its next meeting. The documents that had been received
from non-governmental organizations were available to all members of the Committee.

22. The Drafting Groups and Sub-Drafting Groups were proposing to complete their
work by 19 April and it was hoped that by 20 April, at the latest, it would be
possible to circulate the draft of the final document. The draft of the final
report would be circulated on 19 April. Obviously, any decisions taken between
then and the end of the session, such as a recommendation with regard to
non-governmental organizations and research institutes, would have to be
incorporated into that draft. He suggested that the Committee should either hold
two meetings on 20 April and two on 21 April, or, alternatively, leave the morning
of 20 April free for delegations to study all the drafts.

23. Replying to a question put by Ir. FLEITZER (Federal Republic of Germany), he
said that the list of delegates and summary records of the plenary meetings would
be circulated shortly.

24. Ir. LEMMUYEZ-CONDIEU (France) asked whether the Preparatory Committee would
be meeting as an informal working group or in plenary on 20 and 21 April.
25. Mr. BARTON (Canada) proposed that the Committee should meet as an informal working group on the morning of 20 April and endeavour to complete its work in two plenary meetings, on the afternoon of 20 April and the morning of 21 April.

26. The CHAIRMAN said he was in the Committee's hands. He did not foresee many difficulties in adopting the final report. Members would recall that the Preparatory Committee's report to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly had been adopted without a single amendment. In any case, the amendments were more likely to be of a drafting nature. Where the draft final document was concerned, although there were many square brackets to be removed in some sections, he did not believe there would be any need for renegotiation; it would only be needed to check that the documents fully reflected the discussions in the Drafting Group and Sub-Drafting Groups.

27. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that the Committee should follow the method which had so far given good results, namely to begin the meeting in formal session and then to reconvene as an informal working group should further negotiation prove necessary.

28. Mr. LEHAYEUX-COIFFET (France) said that, in the case of the draft final document, many delegations had not been able to participate directly in the work of the Drafting Group and Sub-Drafting Groups and he foresaw that some of them might wish to introduce substantive amendments. When the Committee met as an informal working group every delegation should be free to give its comments or even to make new proposals. Logically, the Sub-Drafting Groups should report to the Drafting Group which would, in turn, report to the plenary, through the informal working group. However, there would not be time to do that within the space of four meetings.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that the Chairman of the Drafting Group would be making his final report at the Committee's meeting on 19 April and would inform members of the whole conduct of negotiations in the Drafting Group and Sub-Drafting Groups. Delegations would obviously be given an opportunity to comment on the drafts. As a compromise, he suggested that the Committee should meet on the morning of 20 April with a view to holding another meeting in the afternoon and then try, if possible, to complete its work on the morning of 21 April. However, provision could be made for a further meeting on the afternoon of that day, if necessary. He agreed with the method of work proposed by the representative of Mexico.

30. Replying to a question put by Mr. YARGO (Philippines), he said that the draft of the final report should have been distributed by the time the Chairman of the Drafting Group made his report on 19 April and the draft final document would be circulated, at the latest, on the morning of 20 April.

31. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee agreed to the proposed organization of work.

32. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.