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78-70646
The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: May I welcome representatives once again to our meetings. This organizational session, which I hope will be a brief one, has been called in pursuance of a suggestion made in our report to the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, a suggestion contained in paragraph 13 of the Report of the Disarmament Commission, which reads:

"The Disarmament Commission further considers that, in the light of the decisions taken at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly which may have a bearing on the agenda of the 1979 session of the Commission, it might be useful for the Commission to hold another organizational session towards the end of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly". (A/33/42, para. 13).

I should like to explain to representatives that the situation today is that the First Committee has completed its consideration of disarmament issues. A fairly large number of resolutions have been adopted by the First Committee. These resolutions being recommendations of the First Committee will need to go to the General Assembly itself for further consideration and adoption in plenary. To that extent, the resolutions adopted in the First Committee are not yet final decisions of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. This point should be borne in mind.

It could be said that this organizational meeting of the Disarmament Commission might have been better held after the Assembly had completed consideration of the disarmament items on the agenda of the current session. We thought it better to have the Disarmament Commission meet at this stage for practical considerations only. It was indicated to us that meetings of the Disarmament Commission any day beyond early this week would cause inconvenience to delegations, many of whose members would probably have planned their departure from New York. In any case, according to the decision taken, we have to meet during, not after the thirty-third session. This point was brought out indirectly during a meeting of the Bureau this morning. I indicated I was in complete agreement with the point made that resolutions adopted in the First Committee have not yet been considered in plenary.
The second point is that the Disarmament Commission decided to insert paragraph 13 in order to enable members of the Commission to have an opportunity to review the decisions taken at the thirty-third session, decisions, as the Report says, which could have a bearing on the substantive work of our May/June session next year, and as the Report of the Disarmament Commission specifically indicates, a bearing on the agenda of the substantive session to be held next year. This was suggested, and as we know the First Committee has approved the report of the Disarmament Commission, in order to endeavour to agree on what we should discuss at the substantive session in May/June next year. This will enable the Governments of the Member States to make adequate preparation for the substantive discussions to be held in May/June 1979. It is in this context that we are holding this meeting.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The CHAIRMAN: Representatives will have been given a copy of document A/CN.10/L.2, the provisional agenda dated 11 December 1978. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Commission agrees to adopt the agenda as contained in document A/CN.10/L.2.

The agenda was adopted.

REVIEW OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE FIRST COMMITTEE AT THE THIRTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY RELATING TO THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE SESSION OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION TO BE HELD IN MAY/JUNE 1979

The CHAIRMAN: May I draw the attention of members of the Commission to five documents which, in the opinion of the Chair, are relevant in that they contain references to the Disarmament Commission and also to the substantive session of the Disarmament Commission to be held next year.
The documents are, essentially, the draft resolutions adopted in the First Committee.

First there is the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.9 which was adopted by consensus on 27 November at the 52nd meeting of the First Committee. This is on agenda item 125, entitled "Review of the Implementation of the Recommendations and Decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its Tenth Special Session." The draft resolution was originally sponsored by Argentina and six other countries and was adopted by consensus.

There are three paragraphs to which I should like to draw the attention of the Committee. Operative paragraph 1 reads:

"Takes note with satisfaction of the measures adopted, or about to be adopted, to revitalize the multilateral disarmament machinery available to the United Nations among which, in particular, the fact that the Disarmament Commission has just held its first session on organizational matters and that the Committee on Disarmament is already properly constituted in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Final Document embodied in its resolution S.10/2." (A/C.1/33/L.9)

Operative paragraphs 6 and 7 are also relevant. Paragraph 6 reads:

"Invites all States to communicate as appropriate to the Secretary-General all those measures adopted outside the aegis of the United Nations regarding the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session, whether unilateral, bilateral, regional or multilateral." (Ibid.)

Paragraph 7 reads:

"Requests the Secretary-General to transmit periodically the above information, together with any reports he may prepare on similar measures taken within the framework of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, both to the General Assembly and the Disarmament Commission." (Ibid.)
As far as follow-up action on paragraphs 6 and 7 is concerned, this is a matter that I have no doubt the Secretary-General will undertake.

The next document to which I should like to draw attention is A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1, again under agenda item 125, originally a draft resolution sponsored by Algeria and a fairly large number of other countries. In this draft resolution, adopted by the First Committee by 120 votes to none, with 10 abstentions, on 27 November, I should like to draw attention in particular to part B, which is of relevance so far as the Disarmament Commission is concerned. I shall not read out the whole of part B but I shall read the operative paragraphs which are relevant.

Paragraph 1 reads:

"Invites the United Nations Disarmament Commission, taking into account resolution 33/..." - I believe that number is 49, but I am not sure - "of the General Assembly to consider on a regular basis the reports and other documents of the Committee on Disarmament submitted by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly." (A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1)

Paragraph 2 reads:

"Recommends the inclusion in the agenda of the forthcoming session of the UNDC, apart from the consideration of elements of a Comprehensive Programme on Disarmament as a priority item, the following questions related to disarmament:

(i) Consideration of various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, in order to expedite negotiations aimed at effective elimination of the danger of nuclear war;

(ii) Harmonization of views on concrete steps to be undertaken by States regarding a gradual, agreed reduction of military budgets and reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries, noting the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly." (Ibid.)
The third document is A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1, as amended and the two operative paragraphs read:

"1. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the deliberative and negotiating as well as studying organs dealing with the question of disarmament all the proposals and suggestions listed in paragraph 125 of the Final Document, together with all the official documents of the tenth special session of the General Assembly as well as information and comments made by Member States during the thirty-third session of the General Assembly on these proposals and suggestions, except those covered by separate resolutions;

"2. Further requests the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament to report on the state of the consideration of these proposals and suggestions to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session." (A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1)

The next document is A/C.1/33/L.19, a draft resolution under item 47 of the agenda, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission", originally a draft resolution sponsored by Argentina and nine other countries. There are seven operative paragraphs and I think I should read them because they relate specifically to the report of the Disarmament Commission:

"1. Endorses the report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the recommendations contained therein;

"2. Requests the United Nations Disarmament Commission to continue its work in accordance with its mandate, as set down in paragraph 118 of the Final Document of the tenth special session, as well as the recommendations contained in its report and the decisions that the General Assembly has taken at its current session and which have a bearing on the Commission's programme of work in 1979;

"3. Requests the United Nations Disarmament Commission to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session a report on its work, including any recommendations and observations it may deem appropriate;

"4. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the United Nations Disarmament Commission the Final Document together with all the official records of the tenth special session, so that the views and proposals presented by States during the session be available in the implementation of the Commission's programme of work;
(The Chairman)

"5. Requests the Secretary-General to render to the United Nations Disarmament Commission all necessary assistance that it may require for implementing the present resolution;

"6. Further requests the Secretary-General to invite Member States to communicate to him, by 31 March 1979, their views and suggestions on the comprehensive programme on disarmament for transmission to the United Nations Disarmament Commission;

"7. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-fourth session an item entitled: 'Report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission'." (A/C.1/33/L.19)

Finally, we have document A/C.1/33/L.23, under agenda item 40, entitled "Effective Measures to Implement the Purposes and Objectives of the Disarmament Decade", originally a draft resolution sponsored by Ethiopia and eight other countries, adopted by consensus at the 54th meeting of the First Committee, on 28 November.

Operative paragraph 1 reads:

"1. Calls upon the Disarmament Commission to give priority consideration to the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament in its session to be held in 1979 and to exert its best endeavours to transmit its recommendations thereon, through the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session to the Committee on Disarmament;" (A/C.1/33/L.23)
Finally I should like to draw the Committee's attention to another
document, A/33/C.1/L.51, which contains a statement submitted by the Secretary-
General in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General
Assembly on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution
in document A/33/C.1/L.19. I wish to draw the attention of delegations to this
document specifically because of one problem. I shall ask for their comments
later on. The point I wish to make is that in its report the Disarmament
Commission has suggested the possibility of having, during our May-June session,
simultaneous meetings of the plenary and the committee of the whole. The statement
submitted by the Secretary-General gives the financial implications for two
meetings daily and for four meetings daily. I am told that the financial
implications have not as yet been considered by the Fifth Committee; possibly
they will be considered within the next two or three days. But the reason why
the suggestion about simultaneous meetings was included in the report we have
submitted to the thirty-third session is that it was felt that, since the May-June
session of the Disarmament Commission was the first substantive session, it might
become inevitable for there to be a general debate or for general statements to be
made at the beginning of the session. Such general statements will no doubt, be
made in plenary. No decision was taken, and no recommendation was made that there
should be simultaneous meetings. All we said was that there might be a need for
simultaneous meetings and it was put that way because it was felt that if the
May-June session of the Disarmament Commission were to consist only of a general
debate in plenary that would not be very satisfactory.

Therefore, not knowing whether there would be such a general debate and if
there were, how long it might take, and in order to ensure that the Disarmament
Commission would have adequate opportunity to give substantive consideration to the
items on its agenda, in our report to the General Assembly we said that it might
become necessary to have simultaneous meetings. As of now we do not know the
decision of the General Assembly or what decision will be taken in the Fifth
Committee, but, speaking for myself, as Chairman of the Commission, I sincerely
hope that there can be the possibility of having simultaneous meetings, if not right
from the beginning of the substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, on
14 May, then at least from about a week thereafter. I think there should be such a possibility and I hope that the Fifth Committee will keep that possibility open.

There is another possibility I must mention to the Committee: that we here in the Disarmament Commission agree, if possible, that if there is to be a kind of general debate or if general statements are to be made in the Disarmament Commission - statements, I would repeat, of very general nature and not specifically related to the items on the agenda - we could agree that the Disarmament Commission should not have more than a certain number of meetings for that purpose. Possibly the first week of the Disarmament Commission, that is, from the 14th to the 20th, which would provide for 10 meetings, could be devoted to general statements, and the committee of the whole could start its substantive work on the items on the following Monday, the 21st. That is a possibility, and if that is done we might be able to avoid simultaneous meetings.

The Secretary-General's paper (A/C.1/33/L.51) does point out the practical problems he and the Secretariat have in servicing simultaneous meetings of the Disarmament Commission. Paragraph 6 of that document refers to meetings of four other bodies expected to be held at that time: the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology, the Commission on Transnational Corporations, the Committee on Review and Appraisal, and the UNDP Governing Council. This document of the Secretary-General says that if we want to have simultaneous meetings we might consider suggesting which of those bodies should be rescheduled.

I do not believe it is possible for us here in the Disarmament Commission to give any indication as to which of those four bodies - all of which are no doubt very important - should be rescheduled, shortened or cancelled. We cannot do that.

It is in that spirit that I make the suggestion that we could - though for this we shall need the co-operation of all Member States - consider agreeing that the general debate, if there is to be one at the substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, should be confined to the first five days of the four-week session we have planned. If that is agreeable, I should like to add another rider: that we might even consider the possibility - and this is normally done in general debates at regular sessions of the General Assembly - of indicating that those delegations that wish to participate in the general debate or to make a
general statement might so inform the Secretariat sufficiently early so that when we meet on the 14th we can start the meetings seriously and the general statements can begin on that day and, it is to be hoped, be concluded that Friday. This is just a suggestion for the Commission's consideration.
Mr. JOSEPH (Sri Lanka): I have asked to speak on behalf of the non-aligned countries to set forth the views of this group of countries on the tasks that we have accomplished in the First Committee. I find that the notes I have prepared for this intervention contain much of what you have already made known to the Committee just a few moments ago; but I trust you will bear with me in referring to these matters since the working groups of the non-aligned countries on disarmament thought it worthwhile to bring to the attention of this organizational meeting the views of the non-aligned countries on these matters.

When this Commission adjourned its organizational session on 13 October it was after much discussion on the organizational arrangements for the substantive meeting of the Disarmament Commission which is to begin on 14 May 1979. In paragraph 13 of that report, as pointed out by you at the commencement of this meeting, Mr. Chairman, the Disarmament Commission considered:

"... in the light of the decisions taken at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly which may have a bearing on the agenda of the 1979 session of the Commission, it might be useful for the Commission to hold another organizational session towards the end of the thirty-third session of the Assembly." (A/33/42, para. 13)

Resuming the session of the Commission today gives us an occasion to consider further what suggestions we could make for the work of the Disarmament Commission for its meeting in May 1979. There was much discussion at our October session on "the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament" and the order of priority that the Commission should adopt for itself. Now that we have had the benefit of several resolutions that have been adopted in the First Committee of the present session of the General Assembly – although these resolutions that were adopted in the First Committee have yet to be adopted by the General Assembly – it would appear that we have some guidelines that could help us, at least in the initial stages, to recommend the elements of a draft programme for the Disarmament Commission session in May 1979.
I specifically refer to those draft resolutions adopted in the First Committee relating directly to the Disarmament Commission. First, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.9 on the "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". Since we have already gone through most of these in detail, I do not propose to go into it in detail except to point out the very essential items in each of these draft resolutions. This draft resolution was adopted by consensus and, inter alia, took note of the first session on organizational matters of the Disarmament Commission.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.19, also adopted by consensus in the First Committee, endorsed the report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and its recommendations and requested the Commission to continue its work in accordance with its mandate. It also requested the Commission to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session a report of its work.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.23 on "Effective measures to implement the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade", also adopted by consensus, called upon the Disarmament Commission to give priority consideration to the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1, which was also adopted by consensus in the First Committee, referred to the proposals and suggestions contained in paragraph 125 of the Final Document of the tenth special session on disarmament. This draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the deliberative and negotiating as well as studying organs dealing with the question of disarmament all the proposals and suggestions listed in paragraph 125 of the Final Document, together with information and comments made by Member States on these proposals. It is expected that the Secretary-General will seek the advice of his Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies and decide how best the provisions of this draft resolution can be carried out.
I have reserved the next draft resolution of the First Committee with a direct bearing on the Disarmament Commission, A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1, for mention last because it could very well provide the basis for our consideration of the agenda of the Disarmament Commission. This resolution which was adopted in the First Committee by 120 votes to none with 10 abstentions, was initiated and presented by the non-aligned countries in the First Committee, and it is the privilege of the Sri Lanka delegation to present ideas here on behalf of the non-aligned countries for the consideration of this organizational session, so that it will be possible for us to arrive at a consensus on at least a part of the agenda for the Commission's substantive meeting in May 1979.

It will be recalled that paragraph 118 (a) of the Final Document of the tenth special session on disarmament established the United Nations Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body

"...to consider and make recommendations on various problems in the field of disarmament and to follow up the relevant decisions and recommendations of the special session devoted to disarmament. The Disarmament Commission should, inter alia, consider the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament to be submitted as recommendations to the General Assembly and, through it, to the negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament;". (S-10/2, para. 118 (a))

Hence, the non-aligned countries believe that resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1 provides most of the elements for the provisional agenda of this Commission's substantive meeting in May 1979, thus encompassing the general mandate given to the United Nations Disarmament Commission by the tenth special session on disarmament. These would comprise the following consideration of elements of a Comprehensive Programme on Disarmament:

"(i) Consideration of various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, in order to expedite negotiations aimed at effective elimination of the danger of nuclear war;"
"(ii) Harmonization of views on concrete steps to be undertaken by States regarding a gradual, agreed reduction of military budgets and reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries, noting the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly." (A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1, para. 2)

It is the hope of the non-aligned countries that the provisions outlined above will provide a constructive basis for discussion in this organizational meeting and that we will be able to arrive at conclusions by consensus for the substantive meeting of the Commission in May 1979.

Mr. THAM (Kuwait): I would like to comment on the questions raised by the representative of Sri Lanka and by you, Mr. Chairman. My first comment relates to the general debate which you suggested. We have already had two general debates this year in the First Committee. The first general debate related to the implementation of the recommendations of the tenth special session. It was a lengthy debate. Then we had another general debate on all the remaining items, which was more or less a duplication of the first debate. It would seem to my delegation that there would be no point in having a third debate this year which would be a duplication of what we have already been through. For this reason my delegation would like to suggest that we dispense with a general debate this year.

My second point relates to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1. Although this draft resolution was adopted by consensus, my delegation did have some difficulty with operative paragraph 1
of that draft resolution for two reasons: first, we had agreed during our first organizational session, at least the earlier part of it, that with regard to the proposals made during the tenth special session the status of these proposals was such that unless delegations revived them in the First Committee during the present regular session, these proposals would just be relegated to oblivion; and it seems to me that the purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1 was simply to avoid relegating these suggestions to oblivion by giving them a special status and transmitting them in toto to the deliberating, negotiating and studying organs.
The question arises how these functions can be divided among these three types of organ. The studying organs normally come first, and they must facilitate the tasks of the other two. After the studying organs finish their work they can transmit whatever recommendations they decide on to the deliberative organ - which happens to be this Commission - and only after the deliberative organ has pronounced itself and submitted the matter to the General Assembly, through the First Committee, should the negotiating organ concern itself with the proposals.

While I am on the subject of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1, I believe that the Secretariat is required to transmit to us "all the official records of the special session devoted to disarmament", but I do not know what is meant by "all the official records". Of course, we like to read "documents", but we hope "all the records" will be something handy, so that we can read and digest it and seek assistance from it.

Therefore, I should like to know, Mr. Chairman, first of all whether I am correct in understanding that our work will follow the work of the studying organs and that the Committee on Disarmament will not start its work until we finish consideration of the recommendations of the studying organs. My second question is addressed to the Secretariat, which I should like to tell us what is meant by "all the official records of the special session devoted to disarmament", and the extent of the documentation that it will be referring to us.

The CHAIRMAN: The first point just raised by the representative of Kuwait was whether or not we should hold a general debate at the May-June session of the Disarmament Commission. He himself doubts the need for it, since we have had general debates both at the special session and at the regular session. I should like to hear observations on this point from other representatives.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1, since I did not myself participate in the work of the First Committee and the discussions on it, I must confess that it is not quite clear to me what exactly is meant in operative paragraph 1.
However, I would submit to members that, since we are now meeting in the Disarmament Commission, we have to be guided by what follow-up action the Secretary-General will take under that paragraph. I believe that the representative of Sri Lanka said — and perhaps this is something that had been informally agreed, for it is not stated very clearly in the draft resolution — that the Advisory Group is to have a look at this in the first place. But perhaps other representatives who know more about the origin and the meaning of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1 can clarify this point.

With regard to the documents and records, I imagine that the Secretary-General is required to transmit to the Disarmament Commission all the documents and records. It does not necessarily mean that he should send us a voluminous document. It could perhaps be done in the form of a letter where reference would be made to the various documents prepared at the time of the special session. I shall in any case ask the Secretariat about it and it will probably give a clarification, if not today then certainly at tomorrow morning's meeting.

May I ask for comments by other delegations?

Mr. BUKAYI (Zaire) (interpretation from French): I wish to say that I support the first proposal of the representative of Kuwait with regard to holding a general debate at our substantive session. Indeed, at our first meeting a few weeks ago my delegation was one of those that defended the idea of not holding yet another general debate on disarmament, given that we have held the tenth special session a short time ago and that we have just been discussing all the same points during the thirty-third regular session. In my delegation's view, it would really be rather sterile to hold yet another general debate devoted to disarmament.

My delegation supports the idea that after the new organs created by the tenth special session are set up they should start work immediately, that is to say, they should begin substantive consideration of the problems that concern us.
Mr. ERGUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): As it is not my intention to speak on several points at the same time, I shall confine myself to referring to the matter raised by my colleagues from Zaire and Kuwait. I believe that we could indeed do without a general debate, since we shall have four weeks of work. Delegations wishing to make general statements could perhaps have them distributed in the form of working papers and have them listed and numbered by the Chairman of the Commission. In that way, we could save time and concentrate on substantive matters.

Going along with the suggestion made by our colleagues from Kuwait and Zaire, I think that we could at this organizational session take a decision to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to observe that we have now heard three representatives speak on the question of holding a general debate, and that all three of them have indicated that it might perhaps be somewhat sterile and unnecessary to go through the motions of holding another.

I should like to ask whether there are any delegations that feel that we should hold a general debate. Speaking as Chairman, I see some merit in what those three representatives have suggested, that is, to avoid holding a general debate which is too general, but that if there are statements to be made that refer specifically to the issues which the Disarmament Commission is required to deal with substantively, they would certainly be helpful as far as the work of the substantive session is concerned.

I would therefore ask if there are any who feel that we could – at least tentatively for the present – agree to try to avoid a general debate in the form in which we have held general debates at the special session and the regular sessions, and instead have only statements concentrating on or related specifically to the issues to be discussed by the Commission.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, I am perhaps interrupting your train of thought, but I should like, if I may, to make just a few comments on the two points that have so far been raised: the question of holding a general debate and the kind of agenda which we envisage for the first substantive session of the Disarmament Commission.
As far as the general debate is concerned, my delegation agrees with the sentiments that have been expressed against holding yet another general debate. Ours is a deliberative body, and I think that we would do ourselves a service if we proceeded to deliberate on concrete issues. I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that a general debate might be unnecessary, particularly bearing in mind that the first item that we would place on the agenda, on which we have a general consensus, is the consideration of the elements of the comprehensive programme, and the consideration of this question will by its very nature involve a sort of a debate that will be rather general - at least initially.

My delegation therefore agrees that we should do without a general debate.
With respect to the agenda, we have at least three resolutions adopted by the First Committee which recommend that we take up the consideration of the comprehensive programme of disarmament at the first session of the Disarmament Commission. I do not think there can be any difficulty in placing that question as one of the items on the agenda, and perhaps as the first item, of the forthcoming session of the Disarmament Commission.

Resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1, as the representative of Sri Lanka mentioned, contains two other generally phrased items which could constitute two other umbrella items for our discussion in the Disarmament Commission. In this respect, perhaps the representative of Sri Lanka or the representative of Yugoslavia, or some other representative involved in the preparation of these paragraphs, could elaborate somewhat more on the type of questions that could be considered under each of those two items. There are distinctions - perhaps a little fine - and we may gain from that elaboration in order to be clear about what type of questions would be taken up under those two umbrella items. My delegation has its own views on the subject, which I shall refrain from mentioning at this time.

I think that with those three broad items the agenda would be sufficiently comprehensive and, at the same time, specific to enable the Disarmament Commission to embark on the chosen course. There is, of course, the other resolution of the First Committee which recommends that we also consider the proposals and suggestions listed in paragraph 125 of the Final Document. The interpretation of my delegation is that the Disarmament Commission is not prevented from considering any of those proposals and suggestions pending their consideration by the Advisory Board. On the contrary, I think that our consideration of any or all of those suggestions and proposals in paragraph 125 may help in their further elaboration, whether in this or some other body. I think our mandate is to deliberate on all these questions. Therefore, we would suggest that the question of the consideration of the proposals and suggestions listed in paragraph 125 of the Final Document should form the fourth item on the list of the agenda, that is, the three items suggested by the representative of Sri Lanka and a fourth item based on resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1.
The CHAIRMAN: I should like to request the representative of Pakistan to try and give me the wording of the fourth item that he has suggested. I am not asking him to do this straight away, but perhaps he can do so later this afternoon or tomorrow morning.

Mr. SOKALSKI (Poland): I should like to address myself very briefly to the question of the general debate. My delegation is not in favour of prolonged discussions or debates on subjects that have been discussed long enough. But I should be in favour of not committing ourselves at this stage to any decision whether or not to have a general debate. I see some merit, as you do, Mr. Chairman, in having a general debate and it seems to me that what you suggested at the very beginning, namely, that perhaps we should allot a few days at the beginning of the session, depending on the number of delegations willing to speak precisely for that purpose, may be a good idea. I should say because we are a deliberative organ a general debate at the outset would be quite pertinent.

I should like also to draw the attention of members to the fact that paragraph 12 of the report of the Disarmament Commission for the thirty-third session requests Member States to communicate to the Secretary-General views and suggestions on a comprehensive programme of disarmament by 31 March 1979. Resolution A/C.1/33/L.9, operative paragraph 6, to which the Chairman referred:

"Invites all States to communicate as appropriate to the Secretary-General all those measures adopted outside the aegis of the United Nations regarding the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session, whether unilateral, bilateral, regional or multilateral;".

I mention these points - I am sure there will be some others - which, taken together, may give reason for some delegations to make comments or more comprehensive statements.

Therefore, without prejudging our decision, I would merely suggest that we should not jump to conclusions too hastily and that perhaps towards the end of this organizational session we might have a better picture of the over-all situation.
Mr. MUJEZINOVIC (Yugoslavia): Mr. Chairman, first I should like to thank you for the very able presentation of the relevant resolutions which were adopted by the First Committee, and are subsequently to be adopted by the General Assembly, concerning the work of this Commission. I agree with you entirely that those are the relevant resolutions.

I should like to comment on several items. My first comment relates to the organization of the work of the May/June session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. We presume that the current session will be utilized to the utmost in order to agree on the provisional agenda of the substantive session in May/June, and that from the very beginning that session will be a working session devoted to the deliberation on and consideration of the items of the agenda. As the representative of Sri Lanka correctly stated when he presented the views of the non-aligned countries, the agenda, if we follow the decisions of the First Committee, would be more or less clear. With a few additions or modifications, those are the items which should form the agenda of the first substantive session. If we presume that those are the items that will form the agenda, then we feel it would be necessary at the beginning of the session to have a general exchange of views. I would avoid the use of the term "general debate", which reminds us of the general debates that we have every year on disarmament matters both in the plenary meeting and in the First Committee.

The general exchange of views at the beginning of the May/June session should be related to the questions on the agenda. If we presume that most of our time will be spent in an exchange of views and an elaboration of the elements of the comprehensive programme on disarmament, then that exchange of views would be related to the elements of the comprehensive programme. After receiving a number of replies from Member States, it would be necessary to study them. We hope that they will be in our hands by 31 March 1979 and then it would be necessary to exchange views on them in order to agree on the pattern of presentation of those elements, establishing priorities and so forth.
If we agree that this is the main task of the May–June session under the two other items contained in paragraph 2 of part B of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1, namely,

"(i) Consideration of various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, in order to expedite negotiations aimed at effective elimination of the danger of nuclear war;

"(ii) Harmonization of views on concrete steps to be undertaken by States regarding a gradual, agreed reduction of military budgets ...",

when we meet in the May–June session and agreement is reached among the Member States that under those two items we shall have one or two questions to be discussed, then, of course, those questions also can be the subject of this general exchange of views at the beginning of the session.

Therefore, I think I am right perhaps in understanding the positions expressed by the representatives of Kuwait and Zaire as being that we do not need a general debate of a general nature, but I have not understood them as opposing an exchange of views on related matters on the agenda. Therefore, I think we shall need at least one week for this general exchange of views on these related matters.

Depending on how ambitious we are, when we start the "negotiations" – because we are a deliberative and not a negotiating body – on the elements of the programme we should express our views on whether we should have simultaneous meetings of the plenary of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Committee of the Whole or an open-ended committee for the consideration of those elements. On that specific subject I would, of course, appreciate hearing the views of other delegations; but we might or might not have simultaneous meetings of the two bodies in the May–June session. My delegation is very flexible on this matter and we would go along with the prevailing opinion.
The representative of Pakistan has invited my delegation to comment on operative paragraph 2 (i) and (ii) of part B of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1, but I would be rather hesitant and reluctant to be too specific in elaborating on these two subparagraphs. Between now and May–June we cannot be very sure which of the questions would be the most urgent for us to put on the agenda if time permits. There is a list of priorities in the Final Document of the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament; there are anxieties and preoccupations – and we know them. Therefore, I would refrain from entering into specifics at this stage.

I think it is more advisable to remain with this general impression that any question that delegations agree is actually important at this stage when we meet during the substantive session might be taken up. As the representative from Poland rightly said, we might have some treaties and some proposals ready by then, and we might put those questions on the agenda, discuss them, express our views and take positions on them.

Mr. Pérez Hernández (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I believe that actually there is, if not a consensus, at least a general trend to the effect that we should not use the time available in May and June for a general debate. It seems to me that the idea expressed of having an exchange of views regarding specific items to be discussed is quite sufficient: that is to say, not to have a general debate on each and every item that is to be dealt with.
But I should like now to make a comment on something which the representative of Kuwait said about the documents to be sent to the deliberative, negotiating, and study organs. I think that in this respect we should make it perfectly clear that we should not wait for the study organs to complete their work to decide which items we shall consider when we start our work in May-June; because - as has been correctly said on a number of occasions - the Advisory Board appointed by the Secretary-General would certainly not have time to discuss numerous problems, but would select, at the most, four for the appropriate studies. Hence it would be totally impractical for us to wait for the Advisory Board to study all the elements included in paragraph 125 of the Final Document of the special session before the Commission started its work on those items.

That is the comment I wish to make. That is to say, at our May-June session we can very quickly proceed to a consideration of the specific items and have an exchange of views, but not in the form of a general debate. Nor would be wait until the study organ sent us its views. The Commission itself would decide what we are going to do in the time available for this purpose, which seems to me to be very important since we have been requested to give our views on the comprehensive disarmament programme that in due course must be examined by the Committee on Disarmament which could not start its discussion without knowing the opinion of this Commission.
The CHAIRMAN: We have had a fairly useful discussion so far, which I shall try to sum up. Of course, I am not closing the session, but I thought it might be useful to indicate the way that I, at least, have followed the discussion so far and what are the issues still to be agreed upon.

I think that I can safely say that there is a consensus that we should try to avoid at the substantive session of the Disarmament Commission a general debate on disarmament or on the arms race of the kind we normally have in regular sessions of the General Assembly, or of the kind we had at the special session. At the same time, when there are specific issues listed for consideration by the Disarmament Commission, obviously there will be a need for an exchange of views. We do not necessarily have to refer to it as a general debate, but it will be understood that such such an exchange of views will be directed very clearly and specifically to the issues to be considered substantively by the Disarmament Commission. I tend to agree with the representative of Pakistan, who said that, whether the discussion is on the comprehensive programme or on what is contained in operative paragraph 2 (i) of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1, the general exchange of views will certainly tend to cover a wide range of issues.

I think that we can all agree that such an exchange should be confined to the basic questions, and that the Commission should get down to the task of in-depth consideration of the specific issues, particularly that relating to the examination of the elements of the comprehensive programme, which I think is very clear.

The representative of Poland, I think rightly, also referred to the fact that, apart from the views specifically sought from Governments in regard to the elements of the comprehensive programme, there is also reference in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.9 to States submitting information about progress outside the United Nations, whether unilateral or bilateral. We expect that much of this information will be submitted by the States concerned to the Secretary-General for transmission to us even before the Disarmament Commission starts it work in May, because the inputs so provided by the States concerned will help our work very much. This does not, of course, preclude those States from making additional observations at the beginning of the work of the Disarmament Commission should they so desire.
(The Chairman)

As regards the agenda, it is clear from the draft resolutions that consideration of the elements of the comprehensive programme will be possibly the first priority item. I mention this because I think that during the first meeting of our Disarmament Commission there was certainly a consensus that this issue of the comprehensive programme must be given high priority since the recommendations that the Disarmament Commission might make on the comprehensive programme will go through the General Assembly to the negotiating body in Geneva. Quite obviously it has priority and therefore we should all try our best to do as much as possible on the consideration of the elements of the comprehensive programme. As to whether we will be able to complete the work, I think we will have an indication from the replies received in response to the communications that the Secretary-General is required to send to Member States, which should be received by 31 March. But in any case, since this is a matter of great urgency and since, as I mentioned at the last meeting of the Commission, the Committee on Disarmament is, in a sense, waiting for the recommendations from the Commission which will go through the General Assembly to it, we should certainly give that the highest priority and try to accomplish as much as possible on that at the first substantive session of the Disarmament Commission.

We also have the other two items which are specifically to be included as required by the draft resolution adopted in the First Committee. I do have some difficulty in understanding clearly the proposal made by the representative of Pakistan - I think the representative of Cuba also referred to it - and how exactly we will proceed with this. I have not had time to discuss with the Secretariat how it will interpret operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1 and what sort of information will be sent to the Disarmament Commission. If the Secretary-General were to send all that is contained in paragraph 125 of the Final Document to the Disarmament Commission, to the Committee on Disarmament and to the studying organs, there might be some confusion about who was to deal with what. I entirely agree with the representatives of Pakistan and Cuba that the fact that the advisory group will be required to look into this should not prevent the Disarmament Commission from considering some of the matters, which is within its jurisdiction as a deliberative body. I think this is quite correct because, quite obviously, as the representative
of Cuba has said, it is not possible for the advisory group to take up all of these proposals, and I do not believe that the Disarmament Commission needs to wait until the study group has completed the consideration of all of them. Perhaps some *modus operandi* can be worked out whereby the Disarmament Commission may be able to take up some of these issues, again depending upon the availability of time.

As far as the simultaneous meetings are concerned, here again I think that the feeling is that this is something which should be left open - that if it is found necessary to have simultaneous meetings, we should have them, taking into account the short time available to the Commission at its May-June session, but that is something that can be considered later.

As to how we will organize the work - whether there will be simultaneous meetings, whether there will be smaller groups, open-ended committees - I think we can look at that when we get to the substantive session itself. Again, I do sincerely hope that it will be possible to have simultaneous meetings - if not every day, at least in adequate number - provided for by the Secretariat.
Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I would like to refer now to only one point on which there seems to be some confusion, namely paragraph 125 of the Final Document. I ventured to explain this in the first part of this organizational session and I shall now repeat what I said.

To ascertain the meaning and significance of paragraph 125, we must take into account on the one hand its genesis, and on the other the exact wording. This paragraph was the last minute result - in extremis, I think we could say quite accurately - of the last meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee of the tenth special session, between 11 o'clock at night and 1 o'clock in the morning. The sole purpose of this paragraph was to facilitate a consensus for some delegations which felt that it was essential, considering that all their proposals had not been approved, that specific mention be made of their proposals in the Final Document.

It will be recalled that on returning from the informal consultations in one of the rooms adjacent to this, between 11 o'clock at night and 1 o'clock in the morning, the Chairman said that in the interests of objectivity, it had been agreed that delegations which had submitted a proposal contained either in the documents concerning proposals, or in the draft resolutions, or which had appeared in statements made in Plenary, would be entitled to write two or three lines to the Secretariat on those proposals which the Secretariat would then list in the Final Document. That was the intention.

Furthermore, if we read paragraph 125, we see that the special session was very careful to avoid any possible misunderstanding as to its scope. In the tenth line of paragraph 125 of the Final Document we read:

"... the Secretary-General is requested to transmit, together with this Final Document, to the appropriate deliberative and negotiating organs dealing with the questions of disarmament all the official records of the special session devoted to disarmament, in accordance with the recommendations which the Assembly may adopt at its thirty-third session." (S-10/2, para. 125)
The latter part was added in order to cover any specific recommendations which the General Assembly might make during its thirty-third session. Thus, for example, the General Assembly made specific recommendations on the three proposals by France. France submitted separate draft resolutions, and the General Assembly adopted them. This is what is meant by the phrase "in accordance with the recommendations". But the fact that reference is made to transmitting all the official documents means that it is not a matter of transmitting proposals for action.

Paragraph 125 goes on to say:

"Some of the proposals put forth for the consideration of the special session are listed below".

Let us read this and see what this means. There follow some of the proposals submitted for consideration at the tenth special session. This is an illustration of numerous proposals submitted during the special session. Why are these listed and not others? Because these and not others were the ones which delegations submitted to the Secretariat between 11 p.m. and the next morning. That is all.

But the special session did not request us, or the negotiating body, or anyone else to take action on those proposals. Why? Simply because, as has been said here and in other forums, most of these proposals are no longer of any interest at this time. Either action has been taken on them or, if action is required then that is for the future, though not the immediate future. For instance, to take the proposal of Mexico, a simple proposal. This appears under item (ee) of paragraph 125 and was "for the opening, on a provisional basis" of an ad hoc account in the United Nations Development Programme to use for development the funds which may be released as a result of disarmament. This is a very simple proposal and does not require study, nor is it a dead proposal. However, my delegation does not think that this is the right time to submit it. We shall submit it when we think the right time has come - if it ever does.

If the proposal of France is adopted we will not need a provisional procedure because there is the other procedure which is a definite and more ambitious one. I do not want to go through every single one of the proposals; I have already done so in the First Committee. I only wish that we keep it clearly in our minds that
these proposals have not been here listed because they require action either by the negotiating or the deliberative body. They will be sent along with all the final documents, in the usual way. How many times has the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to transmit all documents on a certain item either to the 18-nation Disarmament Committee or to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and it never occurred to anyone that those volumes were to be reproduced as a document of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) or of the Disarmament Committee? All this means that the Secretary-General will proceed in the usual way in these cases. As has been rightly said, the Secretary-General will send a letter to the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission or to the Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva saying, "I am sending you all this documentation which covers 10,000 pages" - or however many there may be, and these will be in the archives of the Disarmament Commission or of the Committee on Disarmament, available to all delegations. But no action will be taken until the delegation concerned requests action. All the proposals have been presented by States Members of the United Nations and all States Members of the United Nations are members of the Disarmament Commission. Any State Member wanting the Disarmament Commission or the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva to take action on a proposal is fully entitled, within its sovereign rights, to request action. This was done by France in the General Assembly, and also by Liberia in connexion with another proposal. We adopted a resolution.

I think we should waste no further time with this matter of the famous paragraph 125. As I see it, the situation is perfectly clear and I find no other possible interpretation than the one I have just tried to give.
The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Mexico has made a very useful statement on paragraph 125 of the Final Document. I should like to add only this to what he said. As regards the various proposals in paragraph 125 draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1 requests the Secretary-General to transmit to all the bodies - the Disarmament Commission, the Geneva Committee on Disarmament and the study organs - all these various proposals and suggestions except those covered by separate resolutions. Obviously, as Mr. Garcia Robles said, there are some proposals here on which the thirty-third session of the General Assembly has already taken action. The Secretary-General is required under paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1 to transmit the remaining proposals in paragraph 125 to those various bodies. What the various bodies will do with the proposals is a different matter. It is not as if these draft resolutions are to be totally shelved, because paragraph 125 did say that a number of these proposals and suggestions deserved to be studied further and more thoroughly. I am sure, therefore, that we all agree that many of the proposals listed in paragraph 125 are very important ones. Some of them were made at the highest level as far as Governments are concerned. I hope we would all agree that it is not the intention that those proposals should be totally ignored or put away completely for ever; certainly not.

When draft resolution A/C.1/33 L.16/Rev.1 asks the Secretary-General to transmit them to various bodies, it is the intention and hope that at some stage some, if not all, of these proposals will come up for consideration. I agree with Mr. Garcia Robles that it would be a waste of time if we were to try to take out some of these things and put them on the agenda of the Disarmament Commission. That would be not only difficult but impossible. These things are there for the Disarmament Commission, or the Committee on Disarmament, or the Advisory Group, to take up as and when it is considered necessary to take them up.

I agree with Mr. Garcia Robles also that the authors of these proposals will certainly have an important role to play in bringing these matters up at the appropriate time. I therefore agree with him that perhaps we need not take too much time in discussing this. The Secretary-General will take the necessary follow-up action on the draft resolution and presumably when we meet in the Disarmament Commission there might be a document from the Secretary-General transmitting the various proposals in paragraph 125 except those on which action
has already been taken by the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. It
does not necessarily mean that one or two or any of those proposals requires to
be treated in a special way or on a priority basis at the substantive session of
the Disarmament Commission.

I should like, particularly, the representatives of Pakistan and Cuba to
give some more thought to this and perhaps when we meet again tomorrow morning we
could look at this again and see how best we should proceed. Speaking for
myself, I must confess I would be somewhat hesitant in trying to put a specific
item on the agenda of the substantive session of the Disarmament Commission on
this unless it was suitably worded.

Mr. Imam (Kuwait): I am sorry to revert to this point once more but
after Mr. Garcia Robles has spoken I think it is inevitable that one should
comment on this. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.16/Rev.1 is quite clear and vague at
the same time. In its operative paragraph 1 it requests the Secretary-
General to transmit to the deliberative and negotiating as well as studying
organs dealing with the question of disarmament - it speaks of "studying
organs", not "the studying organ". When the representative of Sri Lanka spoke he
interpreted "the studying organs" to mean the Advisory Board on Disarmament
Studies, but the wording of this text does not justify such an interpretation,
because when we speak of the studying organs they may include the organ which
deals with the link between disarmament and development, or another organ which
deals with the link between disarmament and international security, and so on.
Perhaps the representative of the Secretary-General may be helpful here in giving
some indication.

My other point relates to the wording of operative paragraph 2. In
the second line it says "to report on the state of the consideration of these
proposals and suggestions to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session, so
we are duty bound to submit a report to the thirty-fifth session on the state
reached in our consideration of these proposals and suggestions, and we cannot
just do nothing about it since we are required to submit a report. The point I
raised earlier was the order of work in which the three types of organs were to
proceed, and I heard many representatives say that we do not have to wait for the
studying organs, that we can do work on our own, which means they are in favour
of duplication, but since many representatives here are also members of the studying organs and of the negotiating body it would seem strange to have these three types of organs simultaneously discussing the same question.

Perhaps one way out might be either for the Secretariat to enlighten us on what you, Mr. Chairman, describe as the follow-up on this draft resolution or, if it is not too late, for the sponsors to undertake a small revision of paragraph 1 in the General Assembly and relieve the Secretariat and all these bodies of having to grapple with the problem, to which nobody has so far found a satisfactory solution.

The CHAIRMAN: As far as the last point made by the representative of Kuwait is concerned, I am not certain myself whether we can expect the sponsors of the original draft resolution to do very much about it at the moment because when once it is adopted by the First Committee it becomes a recommendation of the First Committee and the sponsors of the original draft resolution do not have a proprietary interest in it; it is a draft resolution of the First Committee. Of course it is possible for anyone, not necessarily the sponsors but anyone, to suggest amendments to recommendations of the First Committee in a plenary meeting, but I hope we will not have to go to that extent. We can perhaps ask the representative of the Secretary-General to give some thought to this and perhaps tomorrow we could have some indication of what is required.
I tend to agree with the representative of Kuwait that we should by all means avoid duplication. There is no point in the Disarmament Commission, the Committee on Disarmament and several expert groups looking at the same thing at the same time. But perhaps this is something the Secretariat could look into and ensure that such duplication is avoided, because the Secretariat is perhaps more aware than any of us individually of what issues are discussed or expected to be discussed in the various studying organs.

I am grateful to the representative of Kuwait for explaining that "studying organs", in the plural, means organs other than the advisory group. I think he is correct in that.

Can we, then, leave the matter aside for the time being? We shall certainly return to it tomorrow. In the meantime I would request the representative of Pakistan to give the matter some thought. Although, as I have said, it is not very relevant to them, perhaps some of the sponsors of the original draft resolution may be able to give some further clarification on this matter later on.

As I said at the outset, we must complete our work tomorrow. I do not believe that should be very difficult. I have not sensed any serious differences. Some clarifications are required here and there, but otherwise I think it should be possible for us to finish our work tomorrow. We have scheduled two meetings, and if necessary we shall meet in the afternoon. But in any case we are meeting tomorrow morning at 10.30.

Are there any other observations at this stage?

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico): This is a question that follows up on what you have said, Mr. Chairman. You have quite rightly asked members of the Commission to ponder this matter until tomorrow morning, when we shall perhaps be in a position to submit constructive suggestions. I would add the following, which is linked with what you have said, Sir.

To my mind, the best procedure to follow to avoid any possible overlapping or, one might even say, conflict of jurisdiction with regard to the deliberative organ and the negotiating organ, would be as follows. Of course, the Secretary-General is in duty bound, following the request of the General Assembly, to submit to both the deliberative and the negotiating organs all official documents
of the tenth special session, including all the proposals. Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1 is more selective, but the relevant paragraph of the Final Document covers everything, and the Final Document is still valid. I would therefore say that operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1, which mentions only information and comments made by Member States, would be sufficient with regard to the suggestions and recommendations enumerated in paragraph 5 of the document, apart from those mentioned in individual draft resolutions. These would be sent to both the Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament. So if we were able to agree that the Disarmament Commission should not act concerning any one of the proposals except on the request of the country that initiated one of them, since all the members of the Committee on Disarmament are present, we could commit ourselves here and now to defending the same thesis in that Committee. That is to say, we would agree that the Committee on Disarmament also would act on those proposals only at the initiative of delegations that sponsored them. That would avoid any danger of overlapping, unless, of course, the representative who initiated a draft resolution wanted it to be discussed in both bodies at the same time.

In respect of the deliberative and negotiating organs, and bearing in mind that operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1 mentions the deliberative and negotiating organs, I suggested at a meeting of the Bureau this morning that the words "studying organs" should be put to a vote. There were 76 votes in favour, 17 votes against and 28 abstentions when we voted on them. In the light of that vote and of all the objections to which the phrase has given rise, I wonder whether the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1 - although I agree that it is not the property of its sponsors but of the First Committee - could accept a procedure whereby the words "as well as studying organs" would be deleted from the draft resolution to be submitted for adoption by the General Assembly. I think that might be a possible procedure - to delete that part of the sentence that gives rise to problems. We could then vote on the draft resolution with those words deleted. But obviously the sponsors would have to agree with that suggestion; I do not want the discussion to be reopened in the plenary.
Mr. IMAM (Kuwait): I wish to make a brief comment prompted by the remarks of Ambassador Garcia Robles.

Of course, what happens in the General Assembly regarding the words "studying organs" is not for me to determine or to predict. But, with regard to his proposal that in this Disarmament Commission every single delegation that has submitted a proposal or suggestion under paragraph 125 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session should either intervene in favour of its proposal or have its proposal go into desuetude, I submit that that would not solve the problem. If the Secretary-General is to refer these proposals also to the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva and to various study groups, since, though all Member States are members of the Disarmament Commission but not all Member States are members of the Committee on Disarmament or of the various studying groups, we should be confronted with a very absurd situation in which we had decided not to discuss certain proposals at the initiative of some delegations while other sovereign bodies proceeded to discuss their proposals and perhaps ended up with recommendations. The negotiating body might even give us a draft convention.
Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to speak again in light of your suggestion that we consider this question overnight. But in view of the statement made by Ambassador Garcia Pobles, I would just like to express the point of view of my delegation.

First of all, whatever may have been the intention in listing the proposals in paragraph 125 in the Final Document of the special session, I think that intention has been overtaken by operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1, and that this Commission now has to be guided by that draft resolution and its recommendations. That draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the appropriate deliberative and negotiating and studying organs the proposals and suggestions contained in paragraph 125, except those covered by separate resolutions. Therefore, the Secretary-General, presumably not wishing to make a distinction between the various proposals listed as to whether these are deliberative or negotiating, would send all of them to the Disarmament Commission. Hence, the Disarmament Commission has to act on these proposals. The purpose of the General Assembly in asking the Secretary-General to transmit those documents to the Disarmament Commission, presumably, is not to increase the volume of our records or our documentation, but to ask the Disarmament Commission and the other bodies to act if necessary, as appropriate on the proposals and suggestions.

As the Disarmament Commission, we have to take up consideration of the proposals and suggestions contained in paragraph 125, in accordance with the recommendation of the General Assembly, and to my mind the intention of the General Assembly is quite clear. It has asked not only for proposals and suggestions but also for information and comments made by Member States at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. Therefore it has sent these proposals not with a view to their being placed on the shelf but, on the contrary, for in-depth consideration by the Disarmament Commission. We may after consideration place any or all of these proposals on the shelf, and that will probably be the fate of a large number of them. But we are in duty bound to take up the consideration
of the proposals contained in paragraph 125 at the next session, and I do not think that this consideration is conditional on having the original initiator of any proposal bring it forward. It is for the Commission now, in accordance with the recommendations of the General Assembly, to take up each of these proposals and to decide whether it fits into its mandate and do whatever it wishes to do with a particular proposal.

Therefore, I would submit that we reconsider the question of placing a separate item on the agenda. I think that the separate item arises directly from draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1, and we continue to feel that this should be given appropriate consideration. It is not that Pakistan itself has any proposal among those listed in paragraph 125. On the contrary, we have none; but there are proposals in which we are interested. We would like to see them advanced, and we would like to have the Disarmament Commission take up the recommendations made in the resolutions of the General Assembly.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I think that probably I did not express myself with sufficient clarity when I spoke earlier and that that prevented the representative of Kuwait from grasping accurately what I was trying to say. What I had intended to say, and what I thought I had said, is that since all the members of the Committee on Disarmament - the 35 non-nuclear and four nuclear Powers which have already said that they will participate - are all represented here, all 39 could enter into the commitment here and now that in the Committee on Disarmament they would take on any of the famous proposals listed in paragraph 125. The same position as the one that you suggested for the Commission, that is to say, that no action would be taken on any of them unless a sponsor were to take the initiative of requesting action. That is what I said, and in this way there would not be the remotest danger of what the representative of Pakistan mentioned ever happening.
The second reason why I have asked be allowed to speak again is to say that I very much regret that this will be one of the very few occasions when my delegation totally disagrees with the opinion of the representative of Pakistan. He has told us that the General Assembly has to act on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1. Nowhere in paragraph 1, which requests the Secretary-General to transmit, and so on, is there any indication that it is the General Assembly that has to act in regard to these proposals and suggestions. It is true after that we have paragraph 2 that reads:

"Further requests the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament to report on the state of the consideration of these proposals and suggestions to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session."

In my opinion there is no way that it is possible to infer that the Assembly has to act on these proposals and suggestions. My delegation believes that the Commission would be acting within its competence and in keeping with what was requested of it by the Assembly in paragraph 2 if, in the appropriate report, which could be the next one — the one which is to be submitted to the thirty-fifth session, that is to say, in two years' time — the Disarmament Commission said to the Assembly more or less the following:
The Disarmament Commission, having been specifically entrusted by the General Assembly to give maximum priority to the elaboration of the elements for a comprehensive disarmament programme and, furthermore, having in the course of its deliberations brought up other items of lesser urgency but nevertheless deserving priority, has reached the following conclusions:

with regard to the 33 proposals listed in paragraph 125: since some might be considered to have lost any present need for consideration or any immediate urgency, and others having already been fully covered by General Assembly resolutions, and considering that the sponsors of the remaining proposals, which are very few, are all members of the Disarmament Commission, it would not take any action on any of them unless the State sponsoring the proposal asked it to do so.

It seems to me that the Assembly would welcome such a statement, and, far from deciding that we had not done what was asked of us, it would take the view that we were discharging our mandate in the best possible way and working effectively.
The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to say that I think we have had a fairly lengthy discussion on this matter.

As far as I am concerned, the position is quite clear. Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1 - as it now stands and if it is not amended in the plenary Assembly - is very clear. The Secretary-General has been asked to transmit the proposals and suggestions listed in paragraph 125 of the Final Document to the Disarmament Commission, to the Committee on Disarmament and to the various studying organs. That is very clear, and I have no doubt that the Secretary-General will act accordingly.

As far as the Disarmament Commission - and we are the Disarmament Commission - is concerned, what the Committee on Disarmament might do with them, what the studying organs might do with them, is not for us to say. I should also like to submit that it might perhaps be premature for us at this stage to envisage what sort of report the Disarmament Commission will submit to the thirty-fifth regular session on the status of these proposals. I think that there is still plenty of time. We are required to report to the thirty-fifth regular session of the General Assembly on the state of the consideration of the proposals and suggestions.

I therefore appeal to all representatives to consider the matter in the following way. The Secretary-General will, pursuant to operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1, transmit to the Disarmament Commission, as he will to the other organs, those of the proposals and suggestions in paragraph 125 of the Final Document which have not already been acted upon by the thirty-third regular session of the General Assembly. Therefore, the Disarmament Commission will have these proposals before it. I do not think that there is any doubt about that. Whether the Disarmament Commission will at its first substantive session in May-June 1979 take up some or any of these proposals is premature for us to say. But they will be before the Disarmament Commission, and I think that it is up to it when it meets in May-June 1979 to decide what it should do about them. The proposals are there; their sponsors have not withdrawn any of them. But it is for the Commission when it meets in May-June 1979 to decide what it should do with them, depending on the priorities, the other items to be considered and the time factor.
Similarly, I imagine that the Committee on Disarmament will do the same, although it is not for us to try to guess what will happen in that Committee.

As far as the studying organs are concerned, again it is not for us to say what they will do with the proposals. But, as far as the Disarmament Commission is concerned, if the Secretary-General were to transmit some of these proposals, as he is required to do in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.16/Rev.1, they will be before the Disarmament Commission when we meet in May-June. I think that it is not necessary for us to take any decision at the present time as to how we shall sort this out. We do not even have the letter from the Secretary-General, pursuant to operative paragraph 1.

Mr. JOSEPH (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, your statement just now has been helpful in clarifying for the Commission a point that I wished to make, that is, that it is not for us now to state what the Commission should report to the thirty-fifth regular session as to what it has done with its mandate. Let us see how this goes forward. When I referred to the Secretary-General possibly receiving the advice of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, I thought that was but one of the means that would apply as to the Secretary-General's decision with regard to which particular proposals would be referred to a particular organ.

As you suggested a little earlier, Mr. Chairman, it is for the Secretary-General to decide which proposals and which suggestions he will submit to which organ.

Although draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1 is a draft resolution of the First Committee recommended to the General Assembly, as one of the co-sponsors of the original draft resolution, it was our intention that those proposals and suggestions should not fall by the wayside. It was for the purpose of continuity that that draft resolution was initiated. As some of the representatives here present will recall, a move was made in the First Committee for these very words "studying organs" to be deleted from operative paragraph 1, and the First Committee did not accept that amendment.
It was clear in the minds of the sponsors that "studying organs" meant not only the Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies but also other groups of experts and other groups of consultants - both governmental and otherwise. The purpose was for them to study these proposals. But, as more than one representative pointed out here, much of the work to be done in any of these relevant organs will depend on what the authors of these various proposals wish to do. Some of the sponsors may wish to drop their proposals. If so, well and good. When certain proposals come up before the Disarmament Commission, their proponents might say that they are no longer interested, and the Disarmament Commission would so report to the thirty-fifth regular session of the General Assembly.

What I would therefore suggest, is that we go along with the suggestion that the Chairman made, that we leave it to the Secretariat to carry out the mandate entrusted to the Secretary-General by draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1.

Mr. Imam (Kuwait): Time and again we have heard the words "we shall leave it to the Secretariat to carry out the mandate entrusted to the Secretary-General". We also know that tomorrow we shall probably wind up our organizational session.

My question is this: does the Secretariat intend to give us any information before we wind up our organizational session as to the manner in which the Secretary-General intends to carry out the mandate entrusted to him in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1, and, if not, whether the reason would be that it would rather first have that draft resolution adopted by the General Assembly before it could decide upon what to do?
The CHAIRMAN: I think that what the representative of Kuwait said in the last part of his statement is probably correct in the sense that it might be difficult for us to expect a very precise indication from the Secretary-General of what he intends to do regarding a follow-up of resolutions until they have been adopted. Speaking for myself, it does seem to me that it would be too much to expect the Secretary-General to weed out those various proposals listed in paragraph 125 of the Final Document and decide that some of them should go to the Disarmament Commission, some to the Committee on Disarmament and some to the study groups. Frankly, I do not see that happening. I would imagine that the Secretary-General would transmit all those proposals to all three groups, that is, to the Disarmament Commission, the Committee on Disarmament and the various study groups. It would be for those bodies, after they had received such a communication from the Secretary-General, to decide what they should do with the proposals. We may now consider that part of the discussion on paragraph 125 completed, as far as today is concerned. We can certainly return to it tomorrow if there are any new suggestions.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.