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The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I declare open the organizational session of the Disarmament Commission.

As in past years, the Commission is convened today for a brief session to deal with organizational matters, including the election of new officers for 1990 - in particular the Chairman of the Commission - and the draft provisional agenda for the next substantive session.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Commission agrees to adopt the provisional agenda for this organizational session, contained in document A/CN.10/L.25.

The agenda was adopted.

ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND OTHER OFFICERS FOR 1990

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): In accordance with the established principle of rotation for the chairmanship of the Commission, the candidacy for the chairmanship for 1990 should come from the Group of Asian States. I have to report to the Commission that consultations in that Group have not yet been concluded and therefore we shall postpone the election of the Chairman until the results of the consultations are communicated to the Chair. The Chairman of the Asian Group for the month, our colleague from Cyprus, will be reporting to us when we may meet and communicating to us the name of the candidate. We shall consider this question at our next meeting, on the basis of the result of the consultations now proceeding in the Asian Group.
(The Chairman)

Now I wish to proceed to the election of the other officers of the Commission - eight Vice-Chairmen and a Rapporteur - for the year 1990. In this connection, I wish to announce that we are still awaiting the names of the candidates selected by the Group of African States. Consultations are under way in that Group on the two candidates. Consultations are also still going on in the Group of Asian States, so we are not able to give the names of the candidates for those two positions yet.

The Group of Eastern European States has endorsed the candidacy of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and that of Yugoslavia for vice-chairmanship of the Commission for 1990.

The Group of Latin American and Caribbean States has endorsed the candidacy of Argentina and Ecuador for vice-chairmanship of the Commission for 1990.

Consultations are still going on within the Group of Western European and Other States, and the results will be communicated to us in due course.

If I hear no comment, I shall declare the representatives of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Yugoslavia, Argentina and Ecuador elected Vice-Chairmen of the Commission for 1990 by acclamation.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I wish to extend my warm congratulations to the Vice-Chairmen who have just been elected. I am convinced that they will make an important contribution to the Commission's work during its 1990 substantive session.

As regards the post of Rapporteur, consultations are also still under way. The name of the candidate will be reported to the Commission later - I hope at our next meeting next week.
REVIEW OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE FIRST COMMITTEE AT THE FORTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY RELATING TO THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): As members of the Commission are aware, the First Committee at its current session adopted nine draft resolutions which have direct relevance to the Commission's work. Those draft resolutions will be taken up at the plenary meetings of the General Assembly soon. For the sake of clarity and for the benefit of the members of the Commission, I shall refer to them one by one.

The first draft resolution, concerning the work of the Disarmament Commission, is draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.8/Rev.1, adopted by the First Committee under item 66 (a). It is entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission". Operative paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8 read as follows:

"5. Notes that consultations have been held on the question of ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission in the field of disarmament;

"6. Notes with satisfaction that these consultations have made it possible to reach agreement on ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission, as annexed".

I should now like to read the official English translation of the text as it was negotiated in the Committee, so that there will be no misunderstanding. Paragraph 6, as amended, in English reads:

(spoke in English)

"Commends the results of the above-mentioned consultations on ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission, as annexed".

(continued in French)

The draft resolution continues:

"7. Requests the Disarmament Commission to continue its work in accordance with its mandate, as set forth in paragraph 118 of the Final.
Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, and with paragraph 3 of resolution 37/78 H, and to that end to make every effort to achieve specific recommendations, at its 1990 substantive session, on the outstanding items on its agenda, taking into account the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly as well as the results of its 1989 substantive session;

"8. Also requests the Disarmament Commission to meet for a period not exceeding four weeks during 1990 and to submit a substantive report, containing specific recommendations on the items included in its agenda, to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session".

The text of the annex, which was unanimously agreed by Member States, reads as follows:

"Ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission

"1. Mandate

"The Disarmament Commission reaffirms its mandate contained in paragraph 118 (a) of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament (hereinafter referred to as 'Final Document').

"2. Decision-making method

"The decision-making method described in paragraph 118 (b) of the Final Document should be maintained.

"3. Agenda items

"1. The Disarmament Commission could have a general agenda and a working agenda for each substantive session. The working agenda should be agreed at the Commission's organizational session.

"2. For each session, the working agenda should be limited to a maximum of four substantive items for in-depth consideration.
(The Chairman)

"3. From 1991, no subject should, in principle, be maintained on the working agenda for more than three consecutive years. At each session, the Commission should review, for possible reconsideration, any subject that had been suspended.

"4. If no agreement can be reached on a specific agenda item, the report of the Commission should contain a joint statement or a Chairman's summary of the proceedings to reflect views or positions of different delegations, particularly in the case of those agenda items to be suspended for a period of time.

"5. At its 1990 session, the Commission should make every effort to conclude all its agenda items, except the new substantive items.

"4. Subsidiary bodies

"1. At each annual session, the Disarmament Commission should not establish more than four subsidiary bodies for its substantive agenda items. The allocation of the agenda items to the four subsidiary bodies and the appointment of chairmen for these subsidiary bodies should be decided at the organizational session of the Commission, taking into account the principle of equitable geographical distribution.

"2. The chairmanship of subsidiary bodies should, in principle, be rotated each year; however, at its organizational session, the Commission may decide to extend the term of office of any chairman in the interest of effective work and the speedy conclusion of an item."
"5. **Duration of the substantive session**

1. The Disarmament Commission should meet for a period not exceeding four weeks for in-depth deliberations on substantive items.

2. The duration of each substantive session, in accordance with the established practice, should be flexible and could be shortened. In order to utilize efficiently the conference-servicing resources available, the Commission should decide the duration of each substantive session at its organizational session.

"6. **Organization of work of the session**

1. Each session may have a general debate on agenda items in the plenary meetings, not exceeding three days' duration.

2. Except in the case of new items, there should be no general exchange of views in the subsidiary bodies. The general exchange of views on new items should not exceed two meetings.

3. Subsidiary bodies could begin their work in parallel with the general exchange of views in the plenary meetings.

4. No more than two official meetings should be held simultaneously. This restriction, however, would not apply to informal consultations.

5. The meetings of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies should be provided with full meeting services.

6. All the officers of the Commission should be elected at its organizational session.

"7. **Consultations**

The Chairman of the Disarmament Commission should conduct consultations on matters relating to the work of the Commission, in particular on its
(The Chairman)

working agenda, year round, especially during the meetings of the First Committee of the General Assembly."

In the second draft resolution, A/C.1/44/L.13/Rev.1, concerning conventional disarmament, adopted by the First Committee under item 63 (d), operative paragraph 6 reads as follows:

"6. Requests the Disarmament Commission to consider further, at its 1990 substantive session, issues related to conventional disarmament".

The third draft resolution is A/C.1/44/L.15/Rev.1, adopted by the First Committee under item 63 (f), entitled "Objective information on military matters". Operative paragraph 6 reads as follows:

"6. Requests the Disarmament Commission to include in the agenda for its 1990 session an item entitled "Objective information on military matters".

The fourth resolution, A/C.1/44/L.20/Rev.1, adopted by the First Committee under item 63 (d), is also related to conventional disarmament. Operative paragraphs 2 and 3 read as follows:

"2. Recommends that the report should provide a basis for further deliberations on the subject by the Disarmament Commission;

"3. Requests the Disarmament Commission to continue at its 1990 session the substantive consideration of issues related to conventional disarmament and to report to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session with a view to facilitating possible measures in the field of conventional arms reduction and disarmament".

The fifth resolution, A/C.1/44/L.35, adopted by the First Committee under item 63 (j), concerns naval armaments and disarmament. Operative paragraphs 1 and 3 read as follows:
"1. Notes with satisfaction the report on the substantive consideration of the question of the naval arms race and disarmament by the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission;

"3. Also requests the Disarmament Commission to continue, at its forthcoming session in 1990, the substantive consideration of the question and to report on its deliberations and recommendations to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session".

The sixth draft resolution, A/C.1/44/L.37, adopted by the First Committee under item 63 (h), is related to the question of international arms transfers. Operative paragraph 2 reads as follows:

"2. Requests the Disarmament Commission to continue its deliberation on the matters contained in the above-mentioned resolution during its 1990 session under the item of conventional disarmament".

The seventh draft resolution is A/C.1/44/L.51, adopted by the First Committee under item 63 (l), entitled "Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament". Operative paragraphs 1 and 2 read as follows:

"1. Requests the Disarmament Commission to continue its consideration of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament as a matter of priority at its next substantive session, in 1990, with a view to the elaboration of concrete recommendations and proposals, as appropriate, taking into account, inter alia, the views and suggestions of Member States as well as the aforementioned documents on the subject;

"2. Also requests the Disarmament Commission to submit its report on the subject, including findings, recommendations and proposals, as appropriate, to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session".
(The Chairman)

The eighth draft resolution is part B of A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3, adopted by the First Committee under item 59, regarding the nuclear capability of South Africa. Operative paragraph 12 reads as follows:

"12. Requests the Disarmament Commission to consider once again as a matter of priority during its substantive session in 1990 South Africa's nuclear capability, taking into account, inter alia, the findings of the report of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research on South Africa's nuclear capability".

The last draft resolution is A/C.1/44/L.62, adopted by the First Committee under item 66 (m), entitled "Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade". Operative paragraphs 1 and 2 read as follows:

"1. Takes note of the work of the Disarmament Commission at its session in 1989 on the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade;

"2. Directs the Disarmament Commission, at its substantive session in 1990, to finalize the preparation of elements of a draft resolution to be entitled 'Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade' and to submit them to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session for consideration and adoption".

I have just outlined the nine draft resolutions which have direct relevance to the Commission's work. Does any delegation wish to make a statement in connection with this agenda item?

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I have a question rather than a comment, Mr. Chairman. You were kind enough to read both the French and the English versions of paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.8/Rev.1, in order, as you said, to avoid confusion. Why is the content of the French and English versions different?
As I recall, during the meeting of the First Committee at which that draft resolution was adopted, the Secretary of the Committee read out the English text, the initial phrase of which was "Notes with satisfaction" rather than "Commends".

But that is a minor point. My main question is addressed to the other part of the paragraph, which, as I heard it in French, uses the word "entente", which means "agreement". That is precisely the point some delegations were concerned about, and that is why paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.8/Rev.1 was orally amended by you, Sir, as I recall - to avoid that word in English. I see, however, that it remains in French. Perhaps I could address this question through you, Sir, to the Secretariat, to find out why that discrepancy exists.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I believe it was a question of interpretation. When I presented the amendments, I did so in French. The French text began "Note avec satisfaction", and the interpretation reflected that. But in the amended text in English certain terms were deleted, and we then retained the word "Commends". The interpreter, instead of translating "Note avec satisfaction" as "Commends", gave a literal interpretation.

I believe that it is the only difficulty we had, but the authoritative version of the text is the English-language version that was unanimously agreed by the member States. Thus, if there is some work for the Secretariat to do in that respect, I will ask the Secretariat to act on the basis I have just outlined, unless members have a specific suggestion to make about the French or English versions, in which case we could deal with the question directly before the draft resolution goes to the plenary.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I do not want to delay the proceedings in order to pursue this point indefinitely. But I repeat that, as I
recall, the Secretary of the First Committee read out the English version, and it began with the words "Notes with satisfaction".

But beyond that, as I said earlier, the English text says:

"Notes with satisfaction the results of the above-mentioned consultations on ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission, as annexed".

The French text that you read out, Sir, uses the word "entente", which means that there was agreement on that paper, which does not correspond to the English text as we have it before us. That, I am afraid, is where the confusion really lies. I wonder why the French text does not accord with the English, or vice-versa.

The fact is that, as I recall, the English text was adopted and negotiated before the vote. It should therefore be the governing text, it seems to me, although you read it out in French, of course, Mr. Chairman, when presenting the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I think that we can refer to the governing text, which is the English text. We can take a final decision on it before the draft resolution goes to the plenary Assembly and say that the text, as negotiated before being submitted to the First Committee, should read as follows:

"Commends the results of the above-mentioned consultations on ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission, as annexed".

The French version would read:

"Note avec satisfaction que ces consultations ont permis d'aboutir à des résultats".

In other words, the consultations achieved "results" instead of "understanding", as in the French version.

Does that satisfy the United States?
Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States): I am not a French speaker nor a United Nations translator, but I wonder why you need the phrase "qui ont permis d'aboutir". Can you not simply say in French, "Note avec satisfaction les résultats", which is the exact rendition of the English text?

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Indeed, I believe that we can say that. It certainly does not change much in the text. We would therefore say:

"Note avec satisfaction les résultats obtenus sur les moyens d'améliorer le fonctionnement de la Commission qui sont énoncés à l'annexe".

I shall ask the Secretariat to do the work to align the French text as faithfully as possible with the English version.

DRAFT PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE 1990 SUBSTANTIVE SESSION OF THE DISARMEMENT COMMISSION

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): In preparing the draft paper, account has been taken of the relevant draft resolutions approved by the First Committee, as I indicated a moment ago, and the recommendations contained in the report of the Disarmament Commission to the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly contained in document A/44/42, Supplement no. 42. For the convenience of the members of the Commission, the elements of the draft provisional agenda have been included in document A/CN.10/1989/CRP.10, which has been distributed to all members.

I should like to point out that in that document, items 1 to 9, 11 and 12 are more or less the same as this year's agenda items, with one item deleted and some slight technical changes. Item 10 is a new item, entitled "Objective information on military matters", which was added in accordance with draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.15/Rev.1, approved by the First Committee and to be adopted by the General Assembly.

I now invite members of the Commission to comment on the draft provisional agenda in document A/CN.10/1989/CRP.10.
Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States): I refer to point 7 in the draft provisional agenda before us. The position of my Government on the issue of naval armaments and disarmament is well known and we shall not repeat it here. It was reflected in the United States negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.35 in the First Committee.

I would simply like to point out again that the United States will not participate in any consideration of that item during the United Nations Disarmament Commission session and proceeds on the assumption that the item will be treated in the same way in 1990 as it has been in the past, namely, in consultations under the authority of the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I have taken note of the remarks of the representative of the United States. The new Bureau will take them into account and organize our work bearing that situation in mind.
Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): In the view of my delegation, given the "results" - as they are called in the draft resolution and as my delegation agrees they should be called in the Spanish translation as well - it might be appropriate for all delegations to take those results into account. It might perhaps be useful to have an exchange of views during the debate next May on that question. I think that it would be useful for the Commission itself to have a thorough exchange of views on ways and means of improving the work of the Commission. In other words, the organ itself would be able to take a stand on the question.

The other issue my delegation wishes to raise is this. On the basis of the results of the informal consultations, it has been said that at the 1990 session the Commission should attempt to conclude its discussion of those items that have been on the agenda for some years now. As we look at the provisional agenda before us, we see that there are items that have been on the agenda for some time. My delegation tends to believe that the Commission should act accordingly as regards the four items that are supposed to be given the most attention by the four subsidiary bodies. We feel that we should choose four items from the provisional agenda that have been on our agenda for a long time and give them as much time as possible in the subsidiary bodies, to see whether we can at last conclude our work on those items, as was the wish expressed in the informal consultations.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I believe that the comments of the representative of Cuba cover one of the three ways in which the consultations ended in terms of the results of the work of the Commission. During the substantive session, we will have the time to express our views on those results. I think that that could be done by each delegation, either in the
The Chairman

general debate or when we take up other matters. I believe that, in the general discussion, the Chairman of the Commission will be able to bear that in mind and to hold consultations to see to what extent we can strictly apply all those recommendations for exercises in the future. Clearly, on agenda item 12, entitled "Other business", we can consider that particular question. Thus I fully share the representative of Cuba's opinion on the issue.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the draft provisional agenda for the 1990 substantive session (A/CN.10/1989/CRP.10).

The draft provisional agenda was adopted.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

The Chairman (interpretation from French): As members of the Commission are aware, the organization of work of the next substantive session will be finalized in May 1990. Since the work of the Commission for next year will be heavy, as is reflected in the draft provisional agenda just adopted, with seven substantive items on the agenda, it is extremely important for this organizational session to adopt appropriate measures in order to facilitate the Commission's work next year.

As far as organizing the session is concerned, as in previous years, in addition to the Committee of the Whole, seven subsidiary bodies will be established to deal with the seven substantive items on the agenda. The Commission might wish to set up five working groups for items 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10; a contact group for item 4 (a) and (b); and one consultation group, as usual under the chairmanship of the Chairman of the Commission, for item 7.

Thus, intensive consultations are required during the coming months regarding the substance and proceedings of various subsidiary bodies to deal with the subjects and the equitable distribution of chairmanships among the various subsidiary bodies in accordance with the principle of geographical balance.
(The Chairman)

With regard to substantive items for next year, I must draw the attention of all members of the Commission to the agreed provisions regarding ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Commission, as mentioned a while ago, one of which reads:

"At its 1990 session, the Commission should make every effort to conclude all its agenda items, except the new substantive items".

Another provision reads:

"If no agreement can be reached on a specific agenda item, the report of the Commission should contain a joint statement or a Chairman's summary of the proceedings to reflect views or positions of different delegations, particularly in the case of those agenda items to be suspended for a period of time".

Therefore, all chairmen of the subsidiary bodies will have a heavy responsibility to conclude their respective agenda items in accordance with the agreed provisions I have just mentioned.
(The Chairman)

I have to emphasize - as just noted by the representative of Cuba - that it is vital that the Commission conclude all items which have been on the agenda for many years, with a view to enhancing the functioning of the Commission. I trust that all members will co-operate in that effort and commit themselves to the success of the Commission's work at its 1990 session.

As to the date and duration of the next substantive session, in the report of the Committee on Conferences - A/44/32, page 50 - the session has been scheduled to run from 7 May to 1 June 1990, that is, for four weeks. On the basis of consultations, I think it may be possible for the Commission to complete its work on 29 May 1990, on which date the session could end. If members agree to that timetable, we ought to make full use of all available conference resources from the beginning of the session; all subsidiary bodies should finalize their work by the end of the third week, that is, on 25 May. In that way the Secretariat could work on the reports of the subsidiary bodies and the Commission during the long weekend including Monday, 28 May, which is an official United Nations holiday in New York. On 29 May in the afternoon and, if necessary, in the evening there could be plenary meetings of the Commission to consider all reports of the Commission and hear concluding statements by delegations. The substantive session could be concluded on 29 May.

The Secretariat has prepared a tentative general programme of work for the 1990 substantive session, which has been distributed to delegations. Does any delegation wish to comment on that programme of work?
Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My comments do not relate specifically to the programme of work, but in line with my earlier comments, with which the Chairman appears to agree, I wish to emphasize our need to focus on certain tasks at our next session with a view to completing our work on items that have been on the agenda for a long time. I wish to refer to the allocation of items to the various working groups. For various reasons, including the long history of some items in the Commission's agenda without solution, and the need for consultations in order to complete or work on them, I wish to make a suggestion: in order to intensify our work and enable us to deal with agenda item 4 with full conference services, including interpretation, I suggest that we begin work on item 10 in a contact group and consider item 4 in a working group.

Ms. TAYLOR (United Kingdom): My delegation was very content with the proposals the Chairman put forward earlier on the manner in which the various agenda items would be dealt with. We certainly saw no difficulty with that. With regard to the suggestion just made by the representative of Cuba, I assume this matter will be resolved in accordance with paragraph 7 of the annex to First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/L.8/Rev.1, on ways and means, which says that the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission should conduct consultations on matters relating to the work of the Commission, in particular on its working agenda, year-round. I take it that the Chairman, once elected, will be made aware of this suggestion, along with the comments made in this organizational meeting, and will be pursuing the matter in the consultations he will be conducting in forthcoming months.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I think the representative of the United Kingdom was responding to the concerns expressed by the representative of Cuba.

The elected Chairman will have consultations in keeping with paragraph 7 of the annex to resolution A/C.1/L.8/Rev.1 of the First Committee, which does speak of the consultations the Chairman is to have throughout the year. There will, then, be consultations before the session, and during those consultations the Chairman can settle all organizational matters that may arise.

Mr. FLOREAN (Romania) (interpretation from French): It is our understanding that next year's session of the Disarmament Commission is planned for the period 7 May to 1 June. Is that the case?

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We had proposed from 7 May to 29 May. The work would actually end on 25 May. The reports of the subsidiary bodies would be considered on 25 May, and on 29 May the Commission would take an in-depth look at all the reports adopted on 25 May.

From 25 to 29 May there will be a long weekend, which will allow all delegations thoroughly to consider those reports for approval at the meeting on 29 May, when the report of the Disarmament Commission could also be approved.

Mr. FLOREAN (Romania) (interpretation from French): It was my impression that 7 May to 1 June was the period planned for the session.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Those were the dates originally proposed by the Committee on Conferences, but in the light of consultations and the requirements noted by some delegations, it was proposed that the session end on 29 May, and with the Secretariat's help the programme of work of
(The Chairman)

the session was changed so that those requirements could be borne in mind. We have, then, departed from the plan drawn up by the Committee on Conferences and have taken into account the requirements expressed by some delegations so that the session could end on 29 May.

Mr. FLOREAN (Romania) (interpretation from French): In the light of the serious problems before us on our agenda ought we not to consider the original dates recommended by the Committee on Conferences? Our next session will be a pivotal one, with the Commission moving from one stage in its work to another.
We are striving, to the extent possible, to complete our consideration of items that have been on our agenda for years. That will not be easy, as we know from previous sessions. I therefore think that we ought to have the option of an additional day of work, as proposed by the Committee on Conferences.

Mrs. MULAMULA (United Republic of Tanzania): My delegation sees merit in the observations made by the representative of Romania. As the Committee on Conferences has made provision for our session to end on 1 June, and although I do not know what consultations were held before the Secretariat proposed its programme of work, my delegation thinks we might have left things flexible at this point. I note that the Secretariat has proposed a night meeting on 29 May, from 7 to 10 p.m. I do not see the reason for such pressure if the Committee on Conferences has given us until 1 June.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): From 29 May to 1 June 1990 there are to be meetings of the preparatory committee for the amending conference on the partial test-ban Treaty. Many delegations would have difficulty in attending two meetings at once; some such delegations expressed a desire that the Disarmament Commission's work should end on 29 May. The plan is that the preparatory committee should meet in the morning and the Disarmament Commission in the afternoon and, if necessary, the evening. On 30 May and 1 June, delegations could thus participate actively and fully in the work of the preparatory committee.

Mrs. MULAMULA (United Republic of Tanzania): I understand completely the situation, and withdraw my reservations.

Mr. FLOREAN (Romania) (interpretation from French): We are perfectly satisfied with the proposed arrangements.
Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, you stated that there were to be certain meetings during a certain period in May and June. As we all know, it is for the parties to the Treaty in question to make a decision on that subject. As we all know also, the pertinent paragraphs of the draft resolution dealing with that subject were not supported, either through a negative vote or an abstention, by a number of delegations, I believe approximately 20. Thus, the decision on arrangements for an amending conference has not been made with respect to a preparatory committee. It is the prerogative of the Secretariat to keep in mind certain possibilities, and delegations may have in mind certain preferred arrangements, but I think it would be somewhat inaccurate to state the scheduling of meetings as an accomplished fact. In fact, the draft resolution itself only recommends certain arrangements; a decision on those arrangements is pending.

I wanted to make that clarification so there would be no misunderstanding or misconception on anybody's part.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): It was precisely because of possible difficulties on this issue that I made no mention of it. But since some delegations wished to know why we were to end our work on 29 May I simply had to provide that information to the Commission.

If there are no further comments, may I take it that the Commission agrees that its next substantive session will be held from 7 May to 29 May 1990?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): In conformity with established practice, all organizational work for the next substantive session should be concluded at the Commission's first plenary meeting of that session, because we cannot afford lengthy discussion on those matters in the light of time constraints and our heavy workload. To facilitate that task, as in past years, it would be desirable for the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission to conduct intensive consultations on all related matters with members of the Commission, both in Geneva and in New York, prior to the 1990 substantive session.

Our next meeting will be held when consultations in the regional groups have been completed. At that meeting we shall elect the remaining officers of the Disarmament Commission for its 1990 substantive session.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.