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78-55912
The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to Conference Room Paper No. 20, entitled "Draft final document", which had been circulated in all the working languages, and to Conference Room Paper No. 18/Add.2, which was available at present only in English and contained the changes made by the Working Group in the draft final report.

2. He recalled that the previous day the Working Group had considered the Nigerian proposal to invite the Director-General of UNESCO to participate in the special session. The Working Group had asked the Nigerian delegation to consult with those delegations which wished to state their views in the matter, particularly with the Belgian delegation, in order to prepare a text that the Committee could adopt by consensus.

3. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria) read out the proposal that had emerged from the consultations with the Belgian delegation: "Bearing in mind the special programme which UNESCO has launched on issues relating to disarmament, the Preparatory Committee recommends that the Director-General of UNESCO be invited to make a statement to the Assembly at its special session devoted to disarmament." The proposal, which was based on a similar invitation from the First Committee to the Director-General of IAEA, did not state that the Director-General of UNESCO would participate in the general debate.

4. Mr. ELLIOTT (Belgium) said that Belgium had expressed reservations concerning the initial text because it had referred to participation by a United Nations specialized agency in the general debate. Since it had now been specified that the agency would merely make a statement, there was no longer any reason for those reservations.

5. The recommendation proposed by Nigeria was adopted.

6. The CHAIRMAN recalled that he had recently informed the Committee that the Permanent Observers of the Holy See and Switzerland wished to state their views at the special session, as a result of which a brief debate had arisen; he had learned in informal consultations that the two Permanent Observers had decided to reconsider the situation in the light of the brief discussion which had taken place in the Committee. He wished to express his personal thanks to UNESCO and its Director-General and to the Permanent Observers of the Holy See and Switzerland for their contribution to the cause of disarmament and for the interest with which they had followed the Committee's work since its inception.

7. He recalled that he had been asked to prepare a draft introduction for the final document. He wished to state, for the benefit of the delegations which were not members of the Committee, that he had carried out that task; the draft text (Conference Room Paper No. 19), which he had tried to keep as objective as possible, had been examined at informal meetings. Some delegations had supported the document, and he was grateful to them; however, in view of the reservations expressed...
by the others, he had decided to withdraw it formally. Accordingly, the General Assembly would have to prepare an introduction acceptable to the \textit{149} States Members of the United Nations.

8. 	extbf{Mr. VELLODI} (India) said that he appreciated the Chairman's work on the draft introduction and regretted the fact that the document had not met with unanimous approval in the Committee.

9. 	extbf{The CHAIRMAN} said that he had wished to make sure that the text did not give rise to any controversy; however, any delegation which felt that the draft introduction had some merit was completely free to make use of it.

10. 	extbf{Mr. HARRY} (Australia) said that in his view the draft introduction prepared by the Chairman would make a very important contribution to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

11. 	extbf{Mr. GARCIA ROBLIS} (Mexico) again expressed his gratitude to the Chairman for his draft introduction, which, he felt, could win general approval. To be sure, summary records had been prepared for the open meetings and for the closed meetings of the Committee as a working group, and document A/AC.187/SR.49 related solely to the draft introduction prepared by the Chairman. However, his delegation did not want the 100 or so Member States not represented in the Committee, which were unaware of that text, to think that the Chairman had not prepared his draft introduction as requested. He was still convinced of the value of the draft and considered it a praiseworthy effort to describe the situation objectively and concisely and to state the reasons which had motivated the convening of a special session devoted to disarmament. In order not to place at a disadvantage the States which had not read it, his delegation, supported by the Swedish delegation, requested that the Chairman's draft introduction should be reintroduced and suggested that the full text should be issued in square brackets, which would make it possible to complete the draft final document. Any specific proposals that might be made by some delegations concerning that document would be considered at the special session.

12. 	extbf{Mr. NEPBURN} (Bahamas) fully endorsed the views of the Indian, Australian and Mexican delegations.

13. 	extbf{Mr. BERG} (Sweden) felt that the Chairman's draft introduction was excellent both in substance and in form. For that reason, he had joined the representative of Mexico in requesting that the document should be reintroduced and included - between square brackets if necessary - in the draft final document which would be submitted to the special session.

14. 	extbf{Mr. MISTRAL} (France) also endorsed the draft introduction prepared by the Chairman and supported the proposal by the representative of Mexico to retain the text, while reserving the right to revise all or part of it at the special session.

15. 	extbf{Mr. MESHARRAPA} (Egypt) and 	extbf{Mr. HACHEME} (Benin) expressed their admiration for the way the Chairman had carried out his task and their regret that he had decided to withdraw his draft introduction.
16. The CHAIRMAN said that his draft introduction would be reintroduced by the Mexican and Swedish delegations and issued between square brackets.

17. He recalled that the closed meetings held by the Committee as a Working Group had been recorded in summary records with restricted distribution. However, if it appeared useful to include those summary records among the annexes to the final report, the Committee should decide to give them general distribution.

18. Mr. HARRY (Australia), supported by the Indian delegation, said that according to established usage, closed meetings were not recorded in summary records and that it had been agreed that summary records A/AC.147/SR.119 would be issued with restricted distribution. He therefore hoped that delegations would not press for having the summary records of the Committee's closed meetings issued with general distribution.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that his mention of general distribution had not been, properly speaking, a proposal; the question of restricted or general distribution was, of course, for the Committee to decide. Since the formula he had suggested seemed to give rise to reservations on the part of some delegations, he proposed that the document should be kept in the "restricted distribution" category and therefore should not be issued in the annexes to the final report.

20. It was so decided.

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

21. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to proceed to the second reading of the draft report (Conference Room Paper No. 18). Some changes, issued as Conference Room Paper No. 18/Add.2, had been made in order to ensure general approval of the text.

22. He asked the Committee to state its views on the various sections of the draft report, bearing in mind the aforementioned changes. The first two sections, entitled "Introduction" and "Organization of the Committee's Work in 1977", had not given rise to any objections. In section V, with regard to the proposed change in paragraph 33, the secretariat had informed him that the exact date of the Committee's 17th meeting would be stated in the final report.

23. Mr. ADELOJI (Nigeria) asked whether the rest of the first sentence of paragraph 33 after the word "consensus" would be changed.

24. The CHAIRMAN replied that it would not.

25. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) observed that in section VIII the list of documents in paragraph 41 did not include the draft introduction prepared by the Chairman. He believed, therefore, that the following subparagraph should be added: "Working paper entitled 'Draft introduction to the final document' submitted by Mexico and Sweden". The text itself would appear between square brackets in the draft final document, as had been agreed.
26. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft introduction should indeed be added to the list in paragraph 41. In addition, in section X, paragraph 53 would probably contain the recommendation relating to UNESCO which the Committee had approved at the beginning of the meeting, and the present paragraph 53 would become paragraph 54.

27. Mr. ELLIOTT (Belgium) said that, to judge by the reactions which it had elicited, the proposal made by the Belgian delegation the preceding day concerning paragraph 48 of the Committee's report had not been introduced with sufficient clarity and its interpretation had given rise to some confusion. His delegation had by no means intended to propose that the Committee should impose the rule of consensus on the General Assembly, whose rules of procedure could not be amended in that way.

28. Like a number of other delegations, the Belgian delegation had supported the idea of preparing a single document because it had believed that, by using that device, it would be possible to unite the four sections within one and the same conceptual framework; however, it had assumed that the Committee would reach a consensus on the text as a whole. It would be a pity if some countries, because they were unable to approve or accept some of the provisions in the final document at the special session, subsequently felt bound to reject the text as a whole on account of the Committee's decision to submit a single final document.

29. In connexion with his delegation's viewpoint, it had been argued that the Committee could not revert to a decision which it had taken at its meeting on 10 April; his delegation therefore wished the summary record of the current meeting to indicate that a number of delegations had accepted the recommendation concerning a single final document contained in paragraph 48 only because they had taken it for granted that the work would continue to advance on the basis of consensus and that the adoption of the final document would not constitute an exception.

30. Mr. MISTRAL (France) said that his delegation's interpretation was consonant in every way with the interpretation just given by the Belgian delegation.

31. The CHAIRMAN observed that processing of the draft final document had already begun when the Mexican delegation had proposed, at the meeting held in the afternoon of the previous day, that in the final version, the title of the draft final document should be amended as indicated in paragraph 53 of Conference Room Paper No. 18/Add.2, namely: "Draft resolution embodying a draft final document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament."

32. As the drafting groups and subdrafting groups had had plenty of time to discuss the contents of that document, and bearing in mind its size, he doubted whether there was anything to be gained by reconsidering it paragraph by paragraph and suggested that the Committee should discuss it as a whole.
33. Mr. ASHE (United Kingdom) observed that the foot-note on page 12 of Conference Room Paper No. 20, under the heading "/CTB/", erroneously indicated that the full text of the Treaty would be inserted when available, whereas the intention was to insert the official title of the Treaty.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that the remark of the representative of the United Kingdom was quite pertinent.

35. Mr. BENSMAIL (Algeria), Rapporteur, speaking as Chairman of the Drafting Group, said that the draft final document prepared by the two subdrafting groups had been circulated, in Conference Room Paper No. 20, dated 20 April 1978, to all the delegations which were members of the Committee.

36. He associated himself with the Chairman's observations concerning the first page of that document, whose final version should reflect the comments and proposals made by the representative of Mexico, and he thanked the representative of the United Kingdom for drawing the Committee's attention to the foot-note concerning the title of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

37. In describing the work of the subdrafting group on the declaration and machinery, he said that the group had made definite progress in drawing up the draft resolution and the declaration, under the dynamic chairmanship of Mr. Vuković (Yugoslavia). As all the delegations would have noted, there were no square brackets in the draft resolution, on which agreement had been reached. The number of square brackets in the draft declaration had been considerably reduced. Only a few parts of the wording in the part entitled "Review and appraisal" had yet to be agreed. The paragraph concerning the role of the United Nations was still in dispute. The part entitled "Goals and priorities" contained a consolidated text, although some of the wording had not yet been agreed. Some progress had been made in connexion with the part entitled "Principles", but there were still fundamental differences, some of which were connected with related questions dealt with in the programme of action, including nuclear-weapon-free zones, zones of peace and the unhampered transfer of nuclear technology.

38. The part relating to machinery for negotiating disarmament measures had been partially consolidated. The subdrafting group had succeeded in drawing up some paragraphs, but a number of questions had not been settled and would have to be negotiated at the special session itself. Those questions included, inter alia, the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, the establishment of a deliberative organ in the field of disarmament, the restructuring of CCD and the strengthening of its links with the General Assembly, and the World Disarmament Conference.

* This statement has been given full coverage in the summary record in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee during the meeting.
39. The subdrafting group on the programme of action had also recorded some progress. Commendable efforts had been made to consolidate texts which at the outset had merely stated the positions of the different delegations or of groups of delegations. In addition, the negotiations had helped to clarify positions and to identify the difficulties and problems. Progress had been made in drafting the part entitled "Other weapons of mass destruction", in which the number of square brackets had been considerably reduced. The same was true of the parts relating to conventional weapons, reduction of military budgets and armed forces, and other measures to strengthen international security and to build confidence, although a number of square brackets remained. Furthermore, appreciable progress had been made in drafting the parts entitled "Disarmament and development" and "Information".

40. The draft programme of action contained, in square brackets, a new part D entitled "Implementation of disarmament agreements". That part consisted chiefly of the new proposals submitted by France and the Netherlands concerning the establishment of an international observation satellite agency and an international disarmament organization. The proposals had not been thoroughly discussed in the subdrafting group and therefore remained in square brackets.

41. No significant progress had been possible on some basic questions, including nuclear disarmament, non-use of nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapon-free zones, zones of peace and non-proliferation, in spite of the laudable efforts made by delegations. Those complex and difficult problems should certainly be thoroughly discussed and receive special attention from all delegations prior to the special session.

42. The last two parts of the programme of action, namely, parts H and I, respectively entitled "Comprehensive programme for disarmament" and "Guidelines for implementation", had been fully reproduced in square brackets in the same form as in Conference Room Paper No. 15. The subdrafting group had decided not to consider them at the present juncture owing to their clearly direct connexion with the question of machinery, which had not yet been settled. The square brackets concerned simply indicated that the contents of the two parts had not been negotiated. With respect to the declaration, the titles "Review and appraisal", "Goals and priorities" and "Principles" should be in square brackets; all were agreed that the titles should not appear in the final document and that their purpose was to simplify reference and negotiation.

43. He had dwelt on some aspects of the work of the two subdrafting groups because it seemed necessary to highlight the progress made in carrying out the mandate which the Committee had received from the General Assembly and to indicate the many basic questions on which agreement had not been possible. The scope and complexity of the task which remained to be accomplished at the special session could not be minimized, but he was convinced that the task was not impossible if the spirit of compromise and dialogue which had so far characterized the Committee's proceedings prevailed during the final stage.

44. He expressed his deep appreciation for the valuable assistance and wise counsel which the Chairman had unstintingly given him in carrying out his mission. He was grateful to all the members who had participated in the negotiations for their
co-operation throughout the Committee's deliberations. He also thanked all the officials in the United Nations Centre for Disarmament and the Secretariat, who had spared no effort in facilitating his task, often under very difficult circumstances.

45. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the importance of the explanations given by the Rapporteur, his statement should be given full coverage in the summary record of the meeting.

46. It was so decided.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that he wished to make it clear that the draft introduction submitted by Mexico and Sweden would also appear in square brackets in the draft final document, of which it would constitute section I; if he had understood correctly, the representative of Mexico had proposed the previous day that the title and number of the preamble should be deleted, although the paragraphs would be retained, and section I containing the draft introduction would follow immediately.

48. Mr. FISHER (United States of America) observed that there had been an error regarding the alternative proposed by the United States as contained in the foot-note on page 3; his delegation would therefore like the text to be changed. He pointed out that the second paragraph of alternative 2 under the heading "SALT" (p. 11) was in fact a separate alternative. His delegation would also like the square brackets around the words "international relations" and "can be realized" in alternative 1 on page 13 to be deleted, since they served no purpose in the current version of the draft.

49. The CHAIRMAN said he was sure that the Committee would have no difficulty in accepting the amendments requested by the representative of the United States, who should advise the Rapporteur of the exact wording of the foot-note he wished to see inserted on page 3.

50. Mr. VELLODI (India) said he took it that the cover page of the draft final document (Conference Room Paper No. 20) would be amended in line with the suggestion made by the representative of Mexico and that it would take the form indicated in paragraph 53 of the draft final report of the Preparatory Committee (Conference Room Paper No. 10/Add.2). He proposed that the title of section IV of the draft final document - "Machinery for disarmament negotiations" - should revert to the formulation "Machinery" used in Conference Room Paper No. 20, since it was a fact that the machinery envisaged would cover more than negotiations. While recognizing that the proposal of the representative of the United States with regard to alternative 1 at the bottom of page 13 of Conference Room Paper No. 20 was well founded, his delegation believed that the representative of the United States, in collaboration with the Rapporteur, might be able to find a new wording for the first part of the sentence, now in square brackets, reading "Strict implementation of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations".

51. Concerning the presentation of the draft final document, it was his understanding that the text of the introduction would follow the draft resolution...
and would form section I. His delegation wished to know whether the text of that introduction would be published partly or wholly in square brackets and to point out that it was not mentioned anywhere that, unlike the other sections of the final document, the text of the introduction had been given only preliminary consideration. That fact should be made clear in the draft final document, so that the square brackets would not give the impression that the text had been contested by a large number of delegations.

52. The CHAIRMAN, in response to the last proposal made by the representative of India, suggested that, with the approval of the representative of Mexico, a footnote should be added to indicate that the text of the introduction had been briefly considered by the Committee as a working group but had not been debated in the Drafting Group. He did not think there would be any objections to the first two proposals made by the representative of India.

53. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that his delegation had no objection to section IV of the draft final document being entitled simply "Machinery" and would be prepared to accept whatever solution the Rapporteur, the representative of India and the Chairman considered appropriate with regard to the square brackets in alternative 1 on page 13 of Conference Room Paper No. 20. With regard to the third point raised by the representative of India, since the Rapporteur had indicated in his statement, which would be reproduced in extenso, that it had not been possible to consider one or two parts of the draft final document, he wondered whether the Rapporteur might not also point out that the Committee had not considered the draft introduction either, since it had been submitted only at the present meeting. That was the solution he would prefer, but if the representative of India pressed his suggestion, Mexico would not object.

54. It was decided to adopt the title "Machinery" for section IV of the draft final document.

55. The CHAIRMAN said it was his understanding that the members of the Committee wished to leave it to the Rapporteur, in consultation with the delegations of the United States and India, to solve the problem of the square brackets in alternative 1 on page 13 of the draft final document. As to the clarification relating to the consideration given to the introduction to the draft final document, the comment made by the representative of Mexico was pertinent. Furthermore, it would be appropriate to make it clear that the draft introduction had been submitted to the Committee at the last meeting of the session.

56. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria) pointed out that paragraph 48 of the draft final report of the Preparatory Committee would have to be amended to bring it into line with the amended title of section IV of the draft final document.

57. The CHAIRMAN said that, personally, he would have tended to prefer the more explicit title "Machinery for disarmament negotiations". In any case, he felt that the wording of paragraph 48 was sufficiently clear not to require amendment.
56. Mr. GARCIA POBLES (Mexico) agreed with the Chairman and said that it would be sufficient to amend the title of section IV of the draft final document as proposed by the representative of India.

59. The CHAIRMAN stated that the wording of paragraph 48 of the draft report would therefore not be amended.

60. He suggested that the Committee should adopt its draft final report as amended, together with the draft resolution entitled "Draft resolution embodying a draft final document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament", subject to the amendments proposed by the delegations of the United States, India and Mexico.

61. It was so decided.

62. Mr. VELODI (India) said that, since the Chairman had made it clear that the current meeting of the Committee would be the last of the session, he wondered what action members of the Committee were planning to take during the time remaining before the special session of the General Assembly. The draft final document as it stood was certainly a step forward, but a number of important parts still contained many square brackets. He therefore had some reservations concerning the possibility of a consensus emerging on the draft final document as a whole in the course of the special session. He wondered whether it might not be useful for the members of the Preparatory Committee to meet for informal consultations in order to clear up certain problems and improve the draft document further, prior to the special session, while giving Governments time to study the documents and to evaluate the progress that had been made. It might be possible for the Committee to envisage holding a meeting a week or 10 days before the special session. If members of the Committee were in favour of that suggestion, he thought that the Rapporteur could be entrusted with arranging those consultations.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that that was a valuable initiative and suggested that the representative of India, in collaboration with the Rapporteur, should be responsible for convening those informal meetings of the Committee.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

64. The CHAIRMAN, before declaring the session closed, said he felt sure that the members of the Committee shared his satisfaction at the work that had been accomplished during the fifth session and at the atmosphere of cordiality and mutual comprehension in which the debates had taken place. He commended the members of the Committee for the flexibility they had shown, which had made it possible to adopt all decisions by consensus. That atmosphere had promoted an exchange of ideas which had been all the more fruitful because the discussions had been devoted solely to the matter under consideration, namely, disarmament and preparations for the special session, despite the well-known unavoidable differences on certain political and other issues.

65. He had, however, hoped that more progress would be achieved with regard to the
preparation of the draft final document. Although he recognized that, given the complexity and difficulty of the issues to be tackled, it had been somewhat unrealistic to hope that the Preparatory Committee would be able to find a solution in every case, nevertheless, with a little more effort and goodwill, the members of the Committee might have been able to agree on more complete texts, inter alia on the programme of action and on machinery. From now on, the responsibility would rest with the special session of the General Assembly, and he hoped that it would succeed where the Committee had failed. However, if the facts were to confirm the pessimism of those who claimed that the United Nations was incapable of successfully promoting a genuine disarmament process, then the special session would disappoint many legitimate hopes and, instead of giving new impetus to the cause of disarmament, would serve only to postpone indefinitely any new initiatives in that field. He expressed the sincere hope that, on the contrary, the special session would represent a milestone in the Organization’s efforts on disarmament and that the General Assembly, by adopting the draft final document, would be able to ensure that the special session had the favourable outcome that the whole world was awaiting.

66. On behalf of all the members, he thanked the Committee’s officers, who, motivated by a spirit of comprehension and friendship, had submitted proposals which the Committee had been able to adopt by consensus, and to the Rapporteur who, in his capacity as Chairman of the Drafting Group, and despite the problems that had arisen, had amply contributed to the progress achieved in the preparation of the draft final document and the draft report. He also thanked the Secretariat officials, inter alia those from the Centre for Disarmament.

67. The Chairman declared the session closed.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.