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The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the issue of document A/AC.187/109, containing a background paper on disarmament and verification prepared by the Secretariat; A/AC.187/110, containing a working paper on international mechanisms for disarmament submitted by Italy; Conference Room Paper No. 18, containing the draft final report of the Preparatory Committee; and Conference Room Paper No. 19, containing the Chairman's draft introduction to the draft final document for the special session.

FINAL REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE TO THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (continued)

2. Mr. BENSMAIL (Algeria), Rapporteur, introducing Conference Room Paper No. 18, said that the draft final report provided a full account of the work done by the Committee at all its five sessions. It was concise, objective and factual and similar to the Committee's earlier report (A/32/41) endorsed by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session (resolution 32/88 B). The first five sections of the draft final report reproduced the earlier report in full. Section VI reproduced the operative part of resolution 32/88 B. Section VII described the organization of the Committee's work in 1978. Section VIII listed the documents submitted by Member States in 1978 and also the summary records for the meetings held in plenary and in the Working Group in 1978. Section IX referred to the Committee's decision to annex all its official documents to the draft final report in separate volumes. Section X contained the recommendations prepared by the Committee in 1978 for submission to the special session and noted that both the recommendations regarding non-governmental organizations and the Committee's draft final document for submission to the special session would be annexed to the draft final report once they had been approved by the Preparatory Committee. He drew attention to the fact that in paragraph 17 (3), the word "eighth" should be replaced by "tenth".

3. In the drafting groups, negotiations on the drafts for the declaration, disarmament negotiating machinery and programme of action to be submitted to the special session had been concluded, and the documents in question would be ready for consideration in their final form on 21 April.

4. Mr. VINCI (Italy) pointed out that document A/AC.187/110 submitted by his delegation would have to be included in the list of documents contained in paragraph 41 of Conference Room Paper No. 18.

5. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) pointed out that document A/AC.187/55/Add.1 submitted by the Group of Non-aligned Countries should also be included in that list.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE (continued)

6. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the course of consultations, a number of delegations had asked how many sub-committees or working groups the Committee of the Whole of the special session would have. Any decision in that respect would have to be left to the Committee of the Whole itself. However, as delegations needed to know how...
many representatives to attend the session and the level of such representation, he thought that the Preparatory Committee would be safe in assuming that the Committee of the Whole of the special session would have two working groups, one of which would work on the programme of action and the other on disarmament negotiating machinery. Considerable progress had been made on the declaration, so that all it would require would be a few final touches.

7. A number of delegations had also asked when the Committee of the Whole of the special session would begin its work. Some had suggested that it should not meet during the general debate, while others had held the opposite view. As considerable work remained to be done with regard to the programme of action and disarmament negotiating machinery, he wished to suggest, as a compromise, that the Committee of the Whole should begin its work on 1 June 1978, by which time the general debate, due to begin on 24 May, would be already well under way. The Committee of the Whole would then have until 26 June to complete its work and produce a final document. He recommended, however, that the Committee of the Whole should not meet when Heads of State or Government were speaking in the general debate, which was due to end on 9 June.

8. Mr. YANGO (Philippines) asked how many Heads of State or Government were expected to attend the special session and when they were to speak.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that thus far 11 Heads of State or Government were due to attend the special session and would be free to speak at any time during the general debate.

10. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to endorse his recommendation that the Committee of the Whole of the special session should begin its work on 1 June 1978 and should not meet when Heads of State or Government were speaking in the general debate.

11. It was so decided.

12. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, at the fourth session of the Committee, it had been suggested that non-governmental organizations should draw up a list of organizations to represent them at the special session. The Committee had also decided that non-governmental organizations should participate in the session at the level of the Committee of the Whole and that two meetings of that Committee should be allocated to statements by such organizations. In that connexion, he drew attention to a telegram received from Edith Ballantyne, President of the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council and Convenor of the Co-ordinating Group, and to a memorandum from the Speaker's Committee of the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations (CONGO), both of which had been circulated. He drew particular attention to the guidelines set out in the third and fourth paragraphs on page 2 of the CONGO memorandum, which read as follows:

"Guidelines for carrying through the plan that has developed in the consultations thus far include: (1) each organization will select its own speaker, keeping in mind the coordination necessary for the total group to
be balanced in geographic region, nationality, sex, and age; (2) each speaker will be limited in time, probably to 12 minutes, with the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole asked to enforce these time limits strictly; (3) each speaker, while representing his or her own organization, also will speak in ways to enhance the contribution of the entire NGO community to disarmament; (4) each speaker will attack no State or group of States; (5) organizations and their speakers are to follow the general debate and the special session so that their statements are well informed on United Nations disarmament work.

"On the basis of further consultations with the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee and during the special session with the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, specific provisions will need to be made for: (1) setting the date for a group meeting of all speakers with the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to confer on detailed plans and understandings for the programme of addresses; (2) setting the date required for submission of names of speakers; (3) establishing a simplified and effective liaison and coordinating process for completing the plans for the programme of NGOs speakers and accompanying activities."

13. The Bureau had subsequently discussed the whole issue of participation by non-governmental organizations and research institutes in the work of the special session and had reached agreement on the following points by consensus: that each representative of a non-governmental organization or research institute should speak for not more than 12 minutes in the Committee of the Whole so that a total of 25 speakers could be heard at the two meetings allocated to such organizations and institutes; and that the list of non-governmental organizations submitted by Edith Ballentyne was incomplete and should include non-governmental organizations from developing countries. In that connexion, the Chairman had received from the President of the World Peace Council a copy of a telegram sent to Edith Ballentyne indicating that the list she had drawn up was neither balanced nor representative. Accordingly, the Bureau had decided that the list should also include a representative of Japanese non-governmental organizations and the citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in view of the special nature of their case. The Bureau had also discussed a request for permission to address the special session from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), which was very active in favour of disarmament, and had decided that that request should be dealt with at the same time as similar requests from other research institutes.

14. Accordingly, he suggested that the Committee should recommend to the special session that non-governmental organizations and research institutes should be represented by 25 speakers and be allocated a total of five working hours at the special session, and that the list of such organizations and institutes should be approved in final form by the Committee of the Whole at its first meeting. He also recommended that the day allocated to non-governmental organizations and research institutes should be 12 June, the first available day after the end of the general debate.
15. **Mr. Harry** (Australia) said he presumed that the non-governmental organizations listed by Edith Ballantyne would not have to wait until the special session to hear whether they would be participating in the session. He therefore suggested that, subject to any additions which might make the list more balanced, those organizations already listed should be able to assume that they would be participating in the special session and would be able to start preparing their statements accordingly.

16. The **Chairman** endorsed the suggestion made by the representative of Australia and said that it would also cover the representatives of Japanese non-governmental organizations and the citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and any non-governmental organizations from developing countries which might be added to the list.

17. **Mr. Sokalski** (Poland) said that, if the list was to be more balanced geographically, more socialist countries would also have to be represented. The World Peace Council telegram referred to by the Chairman had in fact indicated that the list was politically and geographically unrepresentative in that it failed to give adequate representation to non-governmental organizations from Latin America, Africa, Asia and the socialist countries.

18. **Mr. Mutuku** (Zambia) pointed out that at the previous session, a number of delegations had already drawn attention to the lack of balance in the representation of non-governmental organizations. He was surprised that the non-governmental organizations had not tried to rectify that situation, and he hoped that they would do so before the special session.

19. The **Chairman** said it was only fair to point out that the non-governmental organizations had to face many problems, including shortage of time, and would have difficulty in submitting an agreed list quickly. However, the interval before the meeting of the Committee of the Whole on 1 June would be long enough for them to make additions to their list on the basis of the Committee's recommendations.

20. **Mr. Kubra** (Iraq) and **Mr. Heshabat** (Egypt) agreed with the representative of Zambia that the present list was insufficiently balanced, and that more speakers from the developing countries were needed.

21. **Mr. Adehiyi** (Nigeria), speaking on a related issue, referred to the statement by the representative of UNESCO at the preceding meeting concerning the programme on disarmament questions launched by UNESCO and suggested that the Committee should consider inviting the Director-General of UNESCO to describe the programme to the special session.

22. **Mr. Liétard** (France) supported the proposal of the representative of Nigeria.

23. The **Chairman** said that the matter would be dealt with when a decision had been taken concerning the non-governmental organizations. He asked whether the Committee approved the procedures for representation of the non-governmental organizations proposed by the Bureau.

24. **It was so decided.**
25. Mr. OGISO (Japan) said that his delegation and Government were grateful for the consideration and sympathy shown to the Japanese non-governmental organizations and the citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by including them in the list of speakers. It was well known that the Japanese people had been the first victims of a nuclear explosion, and it was therefore reasonable that Japanese representatives should speak.

26. Mr. ASHE (United Kingdom), recalling that his delegation had originally made the proposal that a day should be set aside for the non-governmental organizations, expressed deep satisfaction at the decision. He appreciated the difficulty of drawing up an acceptable list of speakers, since many organizations were eager for the honour of speaking to the Committee of the Whole, and hoped that a list which was both geographically and politically balanced could be produced.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that a decision must be made by the Preparatory Committee on the proposal made by the representative of Nigeria to invite the Director-General of UNESCO to state that agency's views and describe its work on disarmament topics. If such an invitation was to be issued, the level of participation must also be decided. The only precedent relating to a specialized agency had been a previous invitation issued to the Executive Director of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The problem was that a number of specialized agencies might wish to participate.

28. Mr. VINCI (Italy) said that he had been deeply impressed by the statement made by the representative of UNESCO at the preceding meeting. While he favoured inviting the Director-General of UNESCO to speak at the special session, the other specialized agencies would then have an equal claim for inclusion, since all their work was concerned with peace and co-operation. However, UNESCO's programme of action was in line with the work done in the Preparatory Committee, and he therefore favoured representation from that agency.

29. Mr. BARTON (Canada) suggested that the Bureau could be empowered to take any interim action required in relation to the specialized agencies, informing them of the forthcoming special session and inviting them to speak if they wished.

30. Mr. PALMA (Peru) said that the Nigerian proposal had great merit. The General Conference of UNESCO had adopted an important resolution on disarmament, and the views of that agency would be of great interest to the General Assembly at its special session. Furthermore, the Nigerian proposal implicitly raised the question of the arrangements to be made concerning participation by organizations in the United Nations system, a question on which further consultations were required.

31. Mr. POKINE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether any other United Nations bodies had expressed a desire to make a statement during the special session devoted to disarmament.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat had received an informal request from the Administrator of UNDP, who had expressed interest in stating that body's views on disarmament.

/...
33. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria) agreed with earlier speakers that it would be wise to hold further consultations on the question of participation by organizations of the United Nations system. His suggestion with regard to UNESCO had been made because that organization had a programme of action on disarmament, and consequently its views would be extremely pertinent to the work of the General Assembly at the special session. At the same time, there were other United Nations organizations whose views would be relevant. Furthermore, the contributions to be made by research institutes such as SIPRI should not be overlooked.

34. The CHAIRMAN said it was clear from the discussion that some members wished to defer a decision until the following meeting.

35. He informed the Committee that the Permanent Observers of the Holy See and Switzerland had expressed interest in participating in the general debate which would be held at the special session. As they were in a position to make valuable contributions, he suggested that the Preparatory Committee might wish to invite them to make statements on the last day of the general debate.

36. Mr. BARTON (Canada) said that to invite the Permanent Observers of the Holy See and Switzerland might give rise to a flood of requests from other permanent observers.

37. Mr. FISHER (United States of America) suggested that a decision should be deferred pending consultations.

38. Mr. VINCENZI (Italy) said that Switzerland, by virtue of its vocation for peace, wisdom and centuries of military experience, and the Holy See, by virtue of its moral influence, could make significant contributions to the work of the special session. As to the possibility of requests from other observers, he believed that the Preparatory Committee should take a pragmatic approach and deal with such requests as they were received.

39. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that Switzerland was the host country of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and many other international organizations. He believed that that consideration and the pertinent comments made by the representative of Italy should be taken into account in reaching a decision. However, since some delegations required time for consultations, a decision would be deferred until a subsequent meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.