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SPECIAL REPORT OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS THIRD SPECIAL SESSION DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT

REPORTS OF SUBSIDIARY BODIES

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with our programme of work we are now approaching the final stage of the current session: consideration and adoption of the reports of subsidiary bodies on the various agenda items and of the draft special report of the Commission, as contained in conference room papers A/CN.10/1988/CRP.2 to CRP.10.

Also in accordance with the agreed programme of work, we should begin to hear concluding statements immediately after we adopt the reports of the Commission as a whole.

We shall now start the process of the consideration and adoption of reports of subsidiary bodies on individual agenda items. I shall call in turn upon the Chairman of each group to introduce the report of the group.

I begin with the report of the Committee of the Whole on work on agenda item 4, contained in conference room paper A/CN.10/1988/CRP.3. The Committee of the Whole established a Contact Group, which, after nine meetings, produced a report to which a text was annexed. At the last meeting of the Committee of the Whole, this morning, we adopted the report of the Committee.

As there are no comments on the document under consideration, I shall take it that it is the wish of the Commission to adopt the report of the Committee of the Whole on work on agenda item 4, as contained in conference room paper A/CN.10/1988/CRP.3.

The report was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Next we shall take up the report of the Consultation Group on agenda item 5, regarding reduction of military budgets, contained in conference

Mr. MELESCANU (Romania), Chairman of the Consultation Group on agenda item 5: The mandate of the Consultation Group, as defined by the General Assembly in its resolution 42/36, was to conclude, at its 1988 session, its work on the last, outstanding, paragraph of the principles that should govern further actions of States in the field of freezing and reduction of military budgets.

The Consultation Group, which met between 4 and 18 May 1988, continued its consideration of that paragraph on the basis of a formulation proposed by the Chairman, which was subsequently amended in the course of the deliberations taking into account the concrete suggestions, and even complete proposals, submitted by various delegations.

While a general agreement was reached on the main elements of paragraph 7 - and while, at the working level, even concrete formulations for that paragraph which did not seem to raise objections were elaborated - it was not possible to arrive at the final approval of the whole paragraph, and consequently there is some bracketed wording in the last phrase of paragraph 7.

It was generally felt that further consideration of paragraph 7 should focus, inter alia, on the last sentence, taking into account the content of that paragraph as a whole.

In view of the progress achieved, the Consultation Group recommends to the Disarmament Commission that the document containing the draft principles which should govern further actions of States in the field of freezing and reduction of military budgets be recommended to the General Assembly for consideration at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

I commend the report, and especially the recommendation in it, to the Commission for adoption.
I wish to take this opportunity also to express my gratitude to all delegations that participated actively and constructively in the Consultation Group's deliberations and to thank them for their contribution. I wish also to take this opportunity to thank Mrs. Hannelore Hoppe, who served with competence as Secretary of the Group.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I have an observation which relates not only to the report now under consideration but also to some others, and that is that my delegation believes we can use the term "recommend" in connection with a document only when the document is agreed upon. In forwarding the documents of certain working groups — documents which have not been agreed upon — to the General Assembly at its special session, the more appropriate term would be "transmit". That term was used just this morning in connection with the report on the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

I suggest that in paragraph 6 of the report of the Consultation Group on item 5, the word "recommended" be replaced by the word "transmitted".

I shall have similar observations in connection with other reports as well.

The CHAIRMAN: As there is no objection, I shall take it that the Disarmament Commission decides to adopt the proposal of the representative of the United States.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to ask the representative of the United States if he will be proposing the same change of word in all the texts.
Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): No, we shall not be proposing the same change in all texts. As I said, my delegation believes strongly that we can use the term "recommend" only in the case of reports that contain agreed texts. Where the reports contain texts that have not been agreed, we should use the term "transmit".

The CHAIRMAN: May I take it that the Disarmament Commission wishes to adopt the report of the Consultation Group on item 5, contained in document A/CN.10/1988/CWG.4, as orally amended?

The report, as orally amended, was adopted.
The CHAIRMAN: Next we shall take up the report of Working Group I on agenda item 6 regarding South Africa's nuclear capability (A/CN.10/1988/CRP.5). I call on its Chairman, Ambassador Edmond Jayasinghe, to introduce the Group's report, on behalf of Ambassador Daya Perera of Sri Lanka.

Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka), Chairman of Working Group I: Before I submit the report I wish to draw attention to a few corrections to the English version and one correction to the French version.

On page 4, the words "not only" at the end of line 5 in the alternative for paragraph 6 proposed by the African Group of States should be deleted and instead inserted after "constitutes" in line 6, so that the sentence reads:

"... the introduction of nuclear weapons into the African continent constitutes not only ..."

Also on page 4, the word "the" should be inserted before "1977" in the first sentence of paragraph 7, so that the paragraph will begin

"The Commission notes the 1977 reports ..."

I now turn to page 7, where the last sentence of the alternative for paragraph 11 (b) proposed by the African Group of States should read:

"The General Assembly should also recommend to the Security Council to enforce and extend the arms embargo against South Africa to cover all aspects ...".

In the fifth line of paragraph 11 (c) there is a typographical error; the word after "already" should be "established".

The first line of the final paragraph of our report, on page 3, should be amended to read:

"At its 9th meeting, on 17 May 1988 ..."

I am told that in the French version of the last paragraph in the fourth line the year is given as 1988. It should read "1989", as in the English version.
Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 42/34 B, the Commission at its 123rd meeting decided to establish Working Group I to deal with agenda item 6, the question of South Africa's nuclear capability, and to make recommendations to the Commission.

During the period 4 to 17 May 1988 the Group held nine meetings and also had informal consultations on its work.

The Group decided that the text of "Conclusions and Recommendations" contained in the Commission's report to the General Assembly at its forty-second session would constitute the basis for its deliberations. The Group also had before it the documents listed in paragraph 4 of document A/CN.10/1988/PV.5, which is before the Commission for consideration. The contents of these documents and the amendments proposed by various delegations and Groups during the course of the Group's work were considered along with the basic text I have mentioned. The deliberations were aimed at agreeing on a consensus text that might be recommended to the Commission.

The discussions on the text were conducted in a friendly and co-operative atmosphere, which assisted tremendously in understanding different viewpoints on various aspects of the item. The cordiality which existed throughout the meetings was demonstrated by the considerable degree of flexibility adopted by individual delegations and Groups. This helpful development paved the way for narrowing the differences on a number of important paragraphs. Eventually the Group was able to reach consensus on paragraphs 1, 5, 7 and 11(e) of the basic text, taking into account the necessary amendments. In view of the complexity of the subject under consideration and the length of time the Commission has taken, since 1979, the ability to reach consensus on these four paragraphs should be seen as a significant achievement.
(Mr. Jayasinghe, Chairman,
Working Group I)

In addition to this decision, the Group was also very much closer to reaching agreement on several other paragraphs. Although lack of consensus prevented their adoption, the degree of agreement reached can certainly be built on in the future. Our achievement during the current meetings leaves us with a happy situation, in which we have been able to agree on a total number of eight paragraphs including the ones the Commission adopted last year: paragraphs 2, 4, 11 (f) and 11 (g).

The Group's inability to agree on the remaining 10 paragraphs of the basic text was due not to lack of interest or enthusiasm by the participants, but purely to the complexity of the item under consideration. However, these discussions will undoubtedly form a useful and helpful basis for our future deliberations.

In concluding the work of the Group, I seize the opportunity to remind representatives that we should spare no effort to reach agreement on the total text, which has been before us for nearly a decade, and that our ability to do so will make a positive contribution to the continued struggle of millions of fellow human beings who are fighting for their just and sovereign rights in South Africa and Namibia.

Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity to thank you for honouring Sri Lanka by inviting it to chair a Working Group which addressed a matter of priority and is entrusted with the task of dealing with a subject going beyond disarmament. Ambassador Daya Perera and I enjoyed every minute of our work.

I also wish to place on record our deep appreciation of the valuable co-operation of Ms. Agnes Marcaillou, Secretary of the Group, and of all other staff who assisted efficiently in our work. Finally, may I say that the task of the Chair was made easier by the helpful co-operation of representatives. I wish to extend my sincere gratitude to them.
The draft report of Working Group I contained in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.5, which is before the Commission, has three sections: the procedural part from paragraph 1 to paragraph 8; the substantive part, consisting of 11 paragraphs; and paragraph 9 at the end, dealing with the Group's recommendation.

I have the honour to submit the report and to commend it - especially its recommendation - for the Commission's acceptance.
The CHAIRMAN: As there are no comments on the document under consideration, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report of Working Group I on agenda item 6 regarding the nuclear capability of South Africa, contained in conference room paper A/CN.10/1988/CRP.5, with the amendments given by Ambassador Jayasinghe of Sri Lanka, on behalf of Ambassador Daya Perera.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Next we shall take up the report of Working Group II on agenda item 7 regarding the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, as contained in conference room paper A/CN.10/1988/CRP.6.

I call on the Chairman of the Group, Ambassador Paul Enzo, representative of the Cameroon, to introduce the report of the Group.

Mr. ENZO (Cameroon) (Chairman of Working Group II): I am afraid I have to begin on a rather unpleasant note. It is a matter of regret that the Secretariat services have insisted on following a procedure that is not helpful. They have had three quarters of the report since yesterday and, in fact, according to my information, had prepared it. Today they were merely supposed to add a single page, which was the result of our work. I believe I discussed this matter with you, Mr. Chairman. I therefore hoped that, at the very worst, they would provide the full text in provisional form for this formal meeting of the Commission. Indeed, they have had the full text. This appears to be a case in which old rules of convenience tend to blur the need for change and the opportunity for change to aid our work.

If the instructions of the Working Group had been followed, it would have been unnecessary for us to waste sheaves of paper producing a draft when in fact we do have a full text and it would have been unnecessary for me to spend time commenting on it. I hope that the Secretariat services concerned will take note of this
incident and avoid similar incidents in the future. We depend so much on the Secretariat and we have, without hesitation, praised the Secretariat's efforts and efficiency, without which our work would be considerably more difficult. It is therefore my misfortune that I must make it necessary for members to refer to the "draft report" on the work of Working Group II. The report released yesterday was called a draft report, but in fact it had been adopted yesterday. Conference room paper A/CN.10/1988/CRP.6/Corr.1 contains what was adopted this morning, which we had hoped to present as an addendum to what had been adopted yesterday. Therefore, it is now a combination of the two papers that we must examine in order to understand the report that is presented to the Commission at this stage of the work of Working Group II on agenda item 7.

With respect to our programme of work - on which we reported to the plenary meeting on a number of occasions and I do not wish to outline it once again - the important thing is to note, first of all, that we chose to work more in informal groups, in view of the nature of the item, rather than in plenary meetings. The experience has been that in plenary meetings when speaking before microphones there is a tendency to make statements at other delegations. However, in the privacy of the informality of smaller rooms, it was possible to exchange notes and written proposals informally.

It was the understanding throughout that the ideas included in annex II of last year's report constituted all the areas that had to be agreed upon before Working Group II could announce agreement on anything. There are, however, instances in which progress had been made. In fact, I could say very loosely that agreements had been reached, even if they must be tentative and must await agreement on other issues in order to surface.
We are presenting to the Commission as an annex to the report which we have here, yet another series of ideas, a document which we hope, when some final work has been done on it, will produce an agreed text for the future. Members will observe from the report that we were only able to deal in any substantial way with the machinery aspect. In that respect, the Contact Group, headed by Ambassador Richard Butler of Australia, attempted to advance the work beyond the stage reached last year. Therefore, in comparing the text of annex II with the annex to the present report one will see that there is some change indeed. It is a pity that Ambassador Butler and his hard-working team were not able to include ideas which reflected some progress because it was not possible for that to be reflected in written form. I should like to underline in the report that Ambassador Butler did give us some idea of the progress made. Unfortunately, however, there were also other areas in which we did not make progress. Those areas consisted of the subject-matter of special sessions, the Security Council and the Conference on Disarmament. Fundamental questions have been raised and, in spite of the effort to try to identify the problems and to solve them, it was not possible to reach any conclusion. However, I think it is essential for me at this stage to congratulate once again Ambassador Richard Butler of Australia, who spared no effort or time and made tremendous sacrifices to ensure that we did reach some agreement. I also wish to mention Ambassador Pierre Morel of France, who on short notice was asked to intervene to try to bring the different sides together on the issue of special sessions. Unfortunately, however, it was not possible to consider in any productive form the results of the consultations that followed the efforts of Ambassador Butler.
(Mr. Engo, Chairman, Working Group II)

It is my hope that in the future, either at the level of the third special session devoted to disarmament, at our level or at the level of the General Assembly, these nagging questions relating not only to the substance but also to the placing of these three items that I have mentioned, will be quickly resolved and that it will be possible for us to address the political questions, without which any agreement to be reached on the question of machinery would be worthless.
I should like to express our profound gratitude also to Mrs. Silvana da Silva of the Department of Disarmament Affairs and the entire team from the Department of Disarmament Affairs for the valuable contribution they have made to our work. On behalf of the Working Group, I should also like to express thanks to the précis writers and the interpreters, who on this occasion were particularly helpful and co-operative, and to the many others in the Secretariat whom we do not see but who have helped.

Finally, I should like to draw specific attention to paragraph 10, which is the recommendation that we bring to the plenary meeting to address in its final report from the Commission. Members will observe that it reads:

"The Disarmament Commission transmits the text contained in Annex" - the annex we have just mentioned -

"of its report to the General Assembly for its consideration, bearing in mind that it was not agreed, with a view to the formulation 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, and the results of the consideration of the relevant agenda item at the Fifteenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the third special session devoted to disarmament"


We hope that this will form a good basis for our consideration of future work.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments?

Mr. NOWORYTA (Poland): My delegation also regrets very much that in paragraph 10 we do not have the text of the annex and that is why I have asked to
(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

speak. My delegation would like to state, first, that it is very far from joining in blaming the Secretariat for the lack of Annex II. If we have to blame someone we must blame ourselves first for the text not being ready within the scheduled time. I should like to make sure that the annex, the text of which we do not have before us now, is the working paper mentioned in paragraph 7 of the paper of 17 May 1988 which, in our work, was called "Convenor's suggestion paper No. 6 of 17 May 1988". In paragraph 9 we mention that the Group has agreed to incorporate paragraphs 1 to 14 of Annex II of the 1987 report. Paragraph 14 happens to be the first paragraph of the "machinery" part which we have not discussed this year. I should like to make sure, therefore, that in the Annex the order will be the same and that paragraph 14 will begin the machinery part, in extenso as it was last year, because my delegation believes that was the agreement.

The CHAIRMAN: With respect to the proposals, does the Secretary wish to respond?

Mr. LIN (Secretary of the Commission): In taking note of the statement made by the representative of Cameroon, the Chairman of Working Group II on item 7, I wish to mention the following: since the Working Group finished its work at about 1 p.m. and the document was required to be ready at 3 p.m., the Documents Control Section informed me that physically it was not possible to have the document ready as a formal document. It turned out, therefore, to be a provisional document for discussion in the plenary meeting. Of course, the Secretariat will do its best in future to accommodate the needs of the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: Does Ambassador Engo of Cameroon wish to respond to the comments made by the representative of Poland?

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon), Chairman, Working Group II: I think the representative of Poland has done no more than emphasize what I had already said.
I pointed out that the first 14 paragraphs in Annex II of last year will appear exactly as they were, and that the text that came to the Working Group from the Contact Group, the document we refer to as Working Paper No. 6, will appear thereafter. Both sides would read Annex 6 of last year to paragraph 14 and thereafter from paragraph 15 we would take over the recommendations that were made this year. I want to assure him that we are saying exactly the same thing.

With regard to the comment made by the Secretary, I want to point out that my grumbling was not about the document being provisional. We would have accepted a provisional document. We should not, however, categorize a document as a draft when it is a final report. It could appear in provisional form but it should be a report and not a draft.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Perhaps there has been a problem of translation here which I did not understand. It is my understanding, however, that last year and again this year the Annex will contain the first paragraphs, 1 through 13, and immediately afterwards will come the title "Machinery" and then we will begin paragraph 14.

The CHAIRMAN: Does that differ from what the representative of Cameroon says?

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon), Chairman, Working Group II: I said "after paragraph 14". Before paragraph 14 the word "machinery" appears. That is why I said "after the end of paragraph 14". What will appear changed in the new text is from paragraph 15 onwards. Everything up to the full stop at the end of paragraph 14 will appear.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that this matter is clear to the representatives of Poland and Cuba. Are there any further comments? I see none.

The report was provisionally adopted.
The CHAIRMAN: The Chair takes note of the comments made by Ambassador Engo of Cameroon and the remarks of the Secretary, and these are reflected in the records.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): Because of the production problems and because the text of the Annex to the report is not yet available in French, I cannot give formal assent to the text but I understand that it will be circulated very shortly and delegations will have it then. I simply wish to remind the Commission of our position.
The CHAIRMAN: We shall now go on to the next report, that by the Consultation Group on item 8 on naval armaments and disarmament, contained in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.12. As members will recall, the Commission decided that, as last year, the Chairman of the Commission would report on the item in consultation with the Co-ordinator of the Consultation Group and interested delegations. Pursuant to the decision of the Commission, I produced the report in this document. I now invite Ambassador Rolf Ekeus, Co-ordinator of the Group, to introduce the report and to make comments.

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): As you just mentioned, Mr. Chairman, I have, under your responsibility, conducted substantive and open-ended consultations in the course of eight meetings on the issue of naval armaments and disarmament.

The Consultation Group had before it several documents, including the report of the Secretary-General containing a study on the naval arms race (A/40/535), the Chairman's paper on agenda item 8 (A/CN.10/102) and various other documents from delegations. The consultations were wide-ranging and covered many complex issues. The consultations on the subject resulted in a number of substantive findings and recommendations which met with the approval of all participating delegations. These findings and recommendations are contained in the Chairman's paper annexed to the report now before the Commission.

It is my understanding that the annex will not be published as part of the report of the Commission but will be issued as a separate document (A/CN.10/113). There are some technical corrections which I am bound to make with regard to the report.

On page 1 of conference room paper 12, three new sub-paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) should be inserted after paragraph 2 (a). They read as follows:
"(b) Study on the Naval Arms race - replies received from Governments (Argentina, Bulgaria, China, Indonesia, Lesotho, Mexico and Sweden - A/CN.10/77; Australia and Norway - Add.1; Gabon - Add.2; Denmark, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland - Add.3);

"(c) Working paper submitted by China (A/CN.10/78);

"(d) Working paper submitted by Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/CN.10/80);"

The following sub-paragraphs are relettered accordingly. The same amendment had to be made on page 3 of the annex, "Chairman's paper on agenda item 8".

Furthermore, on page 2, the second line should be amended to read "The Consultation Group held eight meetings...". In paragraph 4, on the same page, the document number in the third line should read A/CN.10/113, and at the end of the paragraph the following should be added: (see A/CN.10/113, para. 16). That is of course a reference to paragraph 16 of the annex, the Chairman's paper on agenda item 8.

Those are all the corrections to the paper.

In drafting the report, the Consultation Group took the Chairman's paper of last year (A/CN.10/102) as a point of departure for its deliberations and for its report. In comparison with last year's Chairman's paper, some progress has been achieved.

I should like to take this opportunity to thank the delegations which participated in the negotiations for their cheerful co-operation on a very difficult subject. I should like also, on behalf of the Consultation Group, to thank the Secretary of the Consultation Group, Mr. Derek G. Boothby, as well as Mr. Jack Gerardi-Siebert from the Department for Disarmament Affairs, who acted as Deputy Secretary.
The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments on the report?

Mr. STRESOV (Bulgaria): My delegation would like to propose that the annex to the report of the Chairman on agenda item 8 (A/CN.10/1988/CRP.12) be included in the report of the Commission.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): My delegation feels it necessary to state for the record that the decision to hold consultations on item 8 of our agenda was taken, as stated in paragraph 3 of the Chairman's report on that item, by the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission on his own responsibility rather than by the Commission itself.

Also in accordance with paragraph 3 of the Chairman's report on agenda item 8, the Chairman decided to follow last year's course of action, which means that his report, as contained in working paper A/CN.10/113, should not be included in the report of the Disarmament Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: I take note of the comments of the representative of the United States. Are there any further comments?
The CHAIRMAN: As there are no comments on the draft under consideration, I shall take it that it is the wish of the Commission to adopt the report of the Chairman on item 8, contained in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.12, as amended, and also taking into consideration the comments made by the representative of the United States of America.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the report of Working Group III on item 9 regarding conventional disarmament, contained in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.8.

In this regard I call on the Chairman of the Group, Ambassador Mellbin, representative of Denmark, to introduce the report of the Group.

Mr. MELLBIN (Denmark): I have the honour to introduce to the Disarmament Commission the Report of the Working Group III contained in the document just mentioned by the Chairman, a report which was adopted by consensus in the Group on 17 May.

The Group began its deliberations on 4 May on the basis of a draft report which had been considered in 1987. At the end of the 1987 session, much of that draft report had been provisionally accepted by the Group, subject to further discussion of a number of conference room papers and a few reservations on certain parts of certain paragraphs. I therefore resumed the work this year with a cautious hope that the Group might be able to complete its work successfully.

In the event, that hope turned out to be misplaced. As members of the Commission will see from paragraph 6 of conference room paper 6, this year the Group could not reach agreement on the substantive content of the draft report. Indeed, rather than closing, the gap has widened, and there is now less agreement than there was at the end of the work in 1987. As the work is not completed, the Group is recommending that the Disarmament Commission should recommend to the
General Assembly that the Commission should continue its work on conventional disarmament at its next substantive session in 1989.

I wish to make a few brief comments on my own behalf, having been closely associated with this subject for many years and having been the Chairman of the Study on Conventional Disarmament which began its work in July 1982, and completed it some two years later.

The whole subject of conventional disarmament is extremely difficult. Unlike nuclear weapons, nearly all countries possess conventional weapons and, in this uncertain world, need them to protect their national security. Therefore, the sensitivity of the issues involved must never be underestimated and it is inevitable that progress will be slow.

Even so, until now, progress has been achieved year by year. But this year we have fallen back. This is a development that I find regrettable for many reasons, but in particular there are two that I wish to mention today.

First, as has been said so many times, it is conventional weapons that are killing people. Literally thousands of human beings are dead today, as a result of the use of conventional weapons, who were alive this time last year.

Secondly, this regression has taken place at a time when in many other respects the climate of international relations has improved. There have been major changes in attitudes in the past two or three years that have led, and are leading, to valuable progress in arms control and disarmament.

In these circumstances, how is it going to look to the outside world when this Organization is apparently incapable of taking even small steps forward on conventional disarmament? Do we not have to face the fact that it might be detrimental to the public respect which the United Nations should enjoy as the
(Mr. Mellbin, Denmark)

premier multilateral intergovernmental organization with world-wide responsibilities according to its Charter? Do we not even have to face the fact that by our failure we might weaken this very Organization?

With respect, I am not a pessimist. I think we will do better next year. But I hope that delegations will give serious consideration to these questions in assessing the outcome of this year's deliberations on conventional disarmament when the time comes to prepare themselves for next year's Disarmament Commission.

In conclusion, please allow me to revert to the activities of the Working Group and to say something which in fact I said last year, but which holds true this year too, and that is to thank the Under-Secretary-General and all his co-workers, indeed, all the members of the various services of the Secretariat who supported the Working Group in its efforts. I wish to thank in particular the Secretary of the Working Group, Mr. Derek Boothby, for the ingenuity and never-failing loyalty with which he served the Group, its members, and me, as its Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador Mellbin of Denmark for the presentation and also for his comments.

Are there other comments?
Mrs. URIBE de LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to
refer to paragraph 57 in the report before us contained in conference room paper
A/CN.10/1988/CRP.2. The second sentence of this paragraph says:
"... the Commission adopted by consensus the report of Working Group III and
recommendations contained therein regarding agenda item 9 ...
(A/CN.10/1988/CRP.2, para. 57)
On the other hand, if we refer to paragraph 7 of conference room paper
A/CN.10/1988/CRP.8, we see that there is only one recommendation which:
"... recommends to the General Assembly that the Commission should continue
its work on conventional disarmament at its next substantive session in 1989."
(A/CN.10/1988/CRP.8, para. 7)
Consequently, the second sentence of paragraph 57 of conference room paper
A/CN.10/1988/CRP.2 should read as follows:
"At its ____ meeting, on ____ May, the Commission adopted by consensus the
report of Working Group III and recommends to the General Assembly that the
Commission should continue its work on conventional disarmament at its next
substantive session in 1989."
Moreover, my delegation would like to make a few comments of a more general
nature on this report. I leave it up to you, Sir, to decide whether I should make
them now or later, once all the reports have been read and adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Regarding the first comment of the representative of
Colombia, on paragraph 57, I should like to say that that will come under the
paragraph-by-paragraph discussion, when we begin the adoption of the report.
Paragraph 7 of A/CN.10/1988/CRP.8 is what we have before us at this time and it was
not too clear to me why the representative of Colombia referred to paragraph 57 at
this stage. We are coming to a discussion of the reports paragraph by paragraph.
I do not think we can do that now.
It is, I think, appropriate for the representative of Colombia to make her comments now, as long as they are brief.

Mrs. URIBE de LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to thank you Sir, for the efforts you have made throughout the work of the Commission and for the positive results we have achieved. At this session we can be gratified that we have agreed on certain important recommendations, which are contained in the reports of some of the working groups before us now. We are particularly enthusiastic about some of them: verification in all its aspects, confidence-building measures, and the progress made in regard to the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

However, we found it deplorable that there was no progress at all in an area which my delegation views as of the highest interest, that is, conventional disarmament. We are not, of course, going to restate the reasons why the subject of conventional armaments, including the transfer of armaments, the illicit arms trade, and so forth, is of such vital interest to my delegation and to several others, but I do wish to express our displeasure at the way in which this subject was handled on this occasion.

As we have said before, the Disarmament Commission was set up, as we understand it, in order to deliberate. At least, that was the intention of delegations such as mine and others which submitted to Working Group III a number of ideas for discussion there. Unfortunately, the ideas which some of our delegations submitted were not given thorough consideration because too little time was allotted to them and they were not really gone into in depth. That accounts for the poverty of the results of the work of that Group. These initiatives were submitted by us in good faith. We believe that some agreements could have been reached if they had been properly dealt with. Even if that had not happened, my
delegation cannot approve of the fact that the results of those discussions should have been prejudged even before any discussion had taken place. We are sorry to have to use these terms but we are very worried at the establishment of precedents in the Commission which could be detrimental to the objectives for which we are meeting here.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): In the light of the comments made just now by the representative of Colombia and earlier by the representative of Denmark, especially in his personal capacity as Ambassador of Denmark, my delegation would like to raise the question whether or not the Commission finds it appropriate not to mention the third special session devoted to disarmament in its recommendation on this particular subject. After all, we refer some other items at least to the attention, or for the consideration, of the General Assembly at its third special session. In this case, the text as it stands before us does not do that. My delegation, for its part, strongly believes that the question of conventional disarmament certainly should be considered at the third special session and it is incumbent upon the Commission, in the view of my delegation, to make a recommendation to that effect.

Mr. MELBYN (Denmark): It was with some hesitation that I asked to speak. As I have done so, I must say that I agree with the representative of the United States that conventional disarmament should be discussed at the third special session, and I take that for granted. But that is not really why I am speaking. It was rather because I listened very carefully to the remarks of the representative of Colombia as they came out in the interpretation - I regret that I do not understand the Spanish language - so there may be a misunderstanding.
Mr. Wellbin, Denmark

What I heard was that the representative was dissatisfied with the way in which the work of the Working Group was handled; that, unfortunately, it had not deliberated as it should, and that this unfortunate way of handling the Working Group accounts for the poverty of the results of the Working Group; that some agreement would have been possible if these things had been handled better, and that the results were prejudged.

If that was what was said in the Spanish language, I will only say that, of course, it reflects on the way in which I handled the chairmanship of the Working Group and I will not take up a discussion on that basis. But to the best of my belief, I feel entitled to refute these allegations.
The CHAIRMAN: I should like to say that I was just about to give the representative perhaps thirty seconds more, because I thought that the comments were going into a right of reply and I did not think we wanted to get to that stage. However, our purpose now is for all delegations to make comments on the various reports that are being presented, and I trust that these comments are being made by delegations in order to reflect their points of view and their feelings.

While we may not agree about what has to be said or could be said, I think it would be easier if we did not get into this kind of debate, and I would now say the following to the three delegations on my list: if they are going to be talking about what has been said here and there, I will not call upon them.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I promise that I shall not bemoan the fact that the Commission has not been able to condemn South Africa's nuclear capability nor to speak of the matter.

I merely wish to say that the report presented by the representative of Denmark, Ambassador Mellbin, as Chairman of Working Group III, constitutes a very careful balance which should not be disturbed. This entire report (A/CN.10/1988/CRP.2), as its very title indicates - "Draft special report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission submitted to the General Assembly at its third special session devoted to disarmament" - will be taken up by the same Assembly, including the item on the relationship between disarmament and development, which is also on the agenda of the special session.

Therefore, I do not think that we should include any changes in this report.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on the representative of Colombia, bearing in mind what I have said.

Mrs. URIBE de LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): We are not making charges about individual responsibility, let alone concerning the Ambassador who presided over Working Group III. We believe that we would be
failing in our duty if we were not to draw attention to aspects in which there might be room for improvement in the work of our Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: This is precisely in keeping with my reply, that that is the purpose of what we are doing now. I trust that we can all accept it in that light.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, may I begin by assuring you that I have not asked to speak merely to express what you styled as "feelings". May I also say that I am completely prepared to accept the interpretation from Spanish into English. I myself do not speak Spanish, but I am prepared to accept the interpretation I heard in English of the remarks made in Spanish by the representative of Colombia.

I regret that the word "allegations" has been used because I do not think that is what was at issue. I heard a fellow-representative express concerns about the way in which this very important item was handled and I would certainly defend the right of any representative to make such remarks.

The representative of the United States has posed a question about whether or not this item will be considered at the special session. I have understood that what we are doing here this afternoon is, inter alia, adopting a report for the special session. In that sense, it seems clear to me that what appears in the report on item 9 will be a paper before the special session. I think it is very important that that be the case - and I see that you are nodding agreement, Mr. Chairman, that that is the case. Now what our colleague from the United States has said is that it seems to him regrettable that the specific recommendation given in paragraph 7 of document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.8 does not direct this issue specifically to the special session in the way that, for example, we have done in item 7; that is, review of United Nations disarmament machinery, where we have directed the attention of the Assembly at both its special session and its regular
(Mr. Butler, Australia)

session to the issues involved there. I agree with the representative of the United States; I think it is a matter for regret that the present form of recommendation on conventional disarmament does not also find it fit to make mention of the existence of the special session and to call its attention to this subject.

I do not think it should be beyond us to amend the recommendation accordingly and to make reference to the desirability of having this item considered at the special session as well as at the forty-third regular session at the end of this year. If there is very strong resistance to that - which, frankly, I would find a touch incomprehensible - then I am prepared to rest on the knowledge that the report will go to the special session in any case and that the special session will of course consider the issue of conventional disarmament. But I must say that I think the proposal that this recommendation make a specific reference to the special session is justified under the circumstances, and I would be happy to see such a change made.

The CHAIRMAN: In part I was dealing first of all with the comments and I was coming to the proposal raised by the representative of the United States. I brought up this question some time before and I think it is the responsibility of the Group to decide. I am not too sure whether it was discussed, but the representative of Australia is correct that these recommendations, if one wants to call them that, will be sent to the third special session. However, there are other papers with references to special sessions, the third special session, and so on, which I think the reference to the third special session could be added here if it is so desired. If that is not done, the paper will still go to the third special session.
Mr. BUTLER (Australia): I could illustrate my point by simply suggesting that the recommendation given in paragraph 7 of document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.8 could, for example, have a phrase added at the end in the following terms: "taking into account whatever consideration of this subject may take place at the third special session".

The CHAIRMAN: That is a good example. We have such language in a few of the papers. All I should like to find out now is whether it is agreeable that that phrase be included in paragraph 7 of document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.8, with special reference of its being transmitted, or sent or recommended to the third special session.

Mr. SOOD (India): Very briefly, while we have been discussing this point I took the opportunity to leaf through some of the reports we have been considering this afternoon. I find that we have given our present format to certain subjects at the conclusion of our work. We have a specific recommendation in those conference room papers.

On item 5 in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.4, we have such a recommendation in paragraph 6. We have such a recommendation on item 7, but I think it is clear that here the issue is different because the same agenda item appears on the agenda of SSOD III. So it is but natural that, although we have not concluded our work on agenda item 7, we would still like to submit whatever work we have done, with the possibility of perhaps assisting the work of SSOD III on the item.

We have a similar reference in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.9, which deals with verification, because, given the present mandate, I think we have concluded our work. Thus in paragraph 6 of that document we have a reference to SSOD III.
Now, however, I turn to the other side: in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.3, which deals with agenda item 4, we have no such reference — which is not to say that the third special session will not discuss nuclear disarmament, for it certainly will. In A/CN.10/1988/CRP.5, which deals with agenda item 6, "South Africa's nuclear capability," we again do not have such a reference because we have a recommendation that the United Nations Disarmament Commission continue its work on that item next year.

Indeed, as the title of A/CN.10/1988/CRP.2 states, it is the "draft special report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission submitted to the General Assembly at its third special session devoted to disarmament". I think, therefore, that everything in it will be submitted to SSOD III. However, I think that different working groups have used different formats, depending on whether or not they have concluded their work on the agenda item. In that sense, I am not sure if we should bring this in now, because it might raise the issue of bringing a similar recommendation into every single report, which is certainly not what we want to do at this stage. I think that we have a report. We know that it will go to SSOD III. We know that these subjects will be discussed at that session. The United Nations Disarmament Commission was asked to produce a special report for SSOD III, and that is what we are doing.

I am not so sure, therefore, that we need to change anything in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.8 as submitted to us by the Working Group.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall call upon the representative of Denmark for further clarification, but I should like to make a statement before doing so. I thought I had said what the representative of India has said, and I also thought that the representative of Australia had already agreed to that. It was a question of the feeling of some delegations that this item is so very important that something special ought to be attached to it.
However, as I said earlier, that should have been done in the Working Group, and if it was not done there must have been a reason. I do not think we are negating the need for it or whether it should be added. It is, rather, the importance that delegations attach to this question. I hope that this may help others who are asking to speak.

Mr. MELLEBIN (Denmark): I shall be very brief. Once more, in my service at the United Nations, I have had the opportunity to regret that Danish is not a working language here. But I have tried to follow as best I can what is being said by everyone and to use the languages that are at our disposal.

Apart from that, I do not believe - and this was also the sense of your remarks, Mr. Chairman, and of those of the representative of India - that we can change the Working Group's report. I agree that of course conventional disarmament should be discussed at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I had taken it for granted that that would be the case, and that is probably why there is nothing about it in the Working Group's report. However, I thought that we could, as you have suggested, leave it at that, given the fact that we have heard from various representatives around the room that they all agree that that item will be taken up at SSOD III.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): Our friend from India has suggested that the test here should be whether or not work on an item has been completed, and I think he has implied that in a case where it has not been it is perhaps not appropriate to refer the material involved to the third special session. I am afraid that test does not apply. I give as one example the report in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.4 on the agenda item, "Reduction of military budgets," work on which has not been completed but the work on which is, in fact, in paragraph 6, referred to the third special session.
(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Now, with regard to the business of amending these reports, I am sorry, but it is not true to say that we cannot do that. We have already done it in a couple of cases this afternoon in minor ways. The United States has made a proposal, which I support. I gave an example of the kind of language which could modestly achieve this, and I am prepared to repeat that language if required and put it to the test of the membership of the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think there is any disagreement at all with the view that has been expressed about the inclusion of this phrasing, I think that what the representative of India was saying was, in my estimation, to do with semantics; I think he was trying to indicate that it was not necessary to include the phrase.

I go back to what I said before: the importance delegations attach to this item is understandable, but the Working Group decided not to include that wording, knowing that it would be submitted. That, in my estimation, does not negate its going to the third special session. I do not want to prolong this. If we feel satisfied that this is going to be discussed at or sent to the third special session, we might as well leave it at that rather than put any other additional wording in. I must say, very quickly, that eliminating it does not in any way imply that the subject is not important. I would like to suggest, therefore, that we send it as is, include it in the report and see that it is discussed at the third special session.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I shall be very brief. I just want to point out that the report of the Working Group on the review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament - as I pointed out earlier and as Ambassador Butler of Australia has just pointed out again - does refer to the third special session. In fact, we know that there is an item on the agenda of the third special session dealing with that subject. So we all know that the subject will
be taken up. Nevertheless, we felt it necessary to draw the attention of the third special session to the subject.

Now in the case of conventional disarmament there is no such specific agenda item, and therefore it would be useful — from the standpoint of my delegation more than useful: actually necessary — to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the important subject of conventional disarmament. I do not see how this body could show any resistance to some language that would do that.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to repeat once again the only other point I can make, namely, that the Chairman of the Working Group has indicated that this matter was discussed in the Working Group, and that no mention was made of including it. I do not think that we should make an issue of whether it is included or not. I would like once more to request the co-operation of delegations; even though there is no specific agenda item, we all recognize the importance of a discussion on conventional disarmament. I wonder if inclusion of that in the report is going to make the subject more relevant, or ensure that it will be discussed differently.

I am only posing that question, since I do not feel we can continue to debate the issue further at this time. The discussion will be reflected in the record, and we may refer to it by saying that the Commission took note of the statements by delegations that the item was very important and should be discussed at the third special session. However, I should like for us to leave it now as it is and go on to the next subject.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): The representative of Australia reiterated his proposed formulation, and said he was prepared to put it to the test in the Commission. This has not yet, to my knowledge, been done. Perhaps we could do that and see whether the formulation is acceptable to all.
The CHAIRMAN: May I ask the representative of the United States how he proposes we test it?

Mr. AKALOUSKY (United States of America): I do not think that the formulation has been presented to the Commission for reaction.

The CHAIRMAN: I recognize that. I also told the representative of Australia that in several conference room papers we already have language that we could include here. I do not think the representative of Australia is married to his words. If he is, he could suggest them. But all I am saying is that we need to get some agreement on how we are going to do this. That is why I suggested that we merely include a note stating that the Commission notes the concern, and so on, expressed by various delegations.

Mr. AKALOUSKY (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I may be wrong, but I thought that the negative reaction expressed by several delegations was with regard to the language used in other reports of Working Groups referring to the third special session. I am not sure that that reaction necessarily applies - I hope not - to the formulation proposed by the representative of Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: I have to ask the representative of Australia to propose his language again; I do not have it.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): I made a proposal by way of example. It was that at the end of the recommendation given in paragraph 7 of conference room paper 8, we replace the full stop with a comma and add the following words:

"taking into account whatever consideration of the issue takes place at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament."

Mr. MELLBIN (Denmark): Mr. Chairman, I really do not want to make your work any more difficult - I know myself how difficult it is to deal with conventional disarmament - but I do not think we can say that at its seventh
meeting, on 17 May, the Working Group decided what was just proposed by the representative of Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall call on two other speakers in this regard.

Mr. NOWORYTA (Poland): My delegation has listened very carefully to this whole discussion. I do not propose that we reopen discussion on our report, but the proposal that has been made by the representative of Australia has a double significance. First, in its formulation it is very neutral; second, it involves only emphasizing the significance of the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. Therefore my delegation does not see any obstacle to the adoption of this addition. I support the proposal of the representative of Australia.

Mr. Castriota de AZAMBUJA (Brazil): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that your appeals, which were very convincing and reiterated, were not heeded. I think that as usual you spoke with authority and wisdom. This matter should not be reopened.

I think the point just made by the representative of Denmark - I take it in his capacity as Chairman of our Working Group - is absolutely right. A decision was taken on a given date. That decision has to stay as formulated. We cannot participate in wisdom after the fact. We cannot improve on work already accomplished. We cannot change what to some small extent is already history. We have it recorded here: on 17 May, at the seventh meeting, a given Working Group, wisely or unwisely, recommended something. It is done. So, although I very much sympathize with the motives of my colleague from Australia, and I very well know in what spirit he made his proposal, I think we shall get into very difficult terrain if we proceed in this manner.

I think your points, both procedural and substantive, are valid, Sir. All of this is going to the third special session. The matter of conventional disarmament will be discussed at length then. We cannot add to, subtract from or modify a decision taken on 17 May.
Mr. BUTLER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, in order to co-operate with you, and in the light of what has just been said by my colleague from Brazil, I withdraw my proposal. I have noted that what is being said this afternoon is being recorded verbatim, and I know that the same will be true tomorrow, when we shall hear concluding statements. I will content myself with that opportunity.

Mr. ADAM (Sudan): Conference room paper 2 contains the draft of the main report of the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly at its third special session on disarmament. Paragraph 25 of that draft contains the following words in square brackets:

"report of the Contact Group on item 4 (a) and (b) at the 1988 session ... to be added".

This has become the practice for all the Working Groups. Therefore it is my delegation's understanding that the reports of all the Working Groups will appear in the main report of the Disarmament Commission and be considered by the General Assembly at its third special session on disarmament at the appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the views that have been expressed have clarified matters. I do not think there has been any difference of understanding. In view of the co-operative spirit of the representative of Australia in withdrawing his amendment to the paragraph, I take it that the Commission can adopt the report as contained in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.8.

The report was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the draft report of Working Group IV on item 10, regarding verification in all its aspects, as contained in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.9. I call on the Chairman of the Working Group, Ambassador Douglas Roche, representative of Canada, to introduce the report.
Mr. ROCHE (Canada): Before submitting the draft report to the Commission I should like to make a few technical corrections to the report as distributed. We finished work late last night, and it was quite a rush to get the report completed, so there are a few more or less typographical errors I should like to draw to the Commission's attention.
(Mr. Roche, Chairman, Working Group IV)

Beginning with page 1 of document A/CN.10/1988/CBP.9, the title should read "Report of Working Group IV", and the last line of the quotation in paragraph 1 should read

"third special session devoted to disarmament and to its forty-third session". In paragraph 6, the words "be submitted" should read "be recommended".

On page 6, the last sentence of section III, paragraph 1, should begin "Such a contribution can be viewed as in accordance with the central role ...".

Finally, the second sentence of section III, paragraph 2, should begin "These proposals, which were discussed but on which no consensus was possible, ...".

With those technical corrections out of the way, I have the honour to present the report of Working Group IV, on verification in all its aspects, a report which is sent to the Commission by consensus. It concludes the work of the Disarmament Commission on this important item, as requested by the General Assembly in its resolution 42/42 F.

In my view, this consensus report is significant for several reasons. First of all, in its section on principles it has a listing of 16 principles the Working Group adopted by consensus. Its section II relates to provisions and techniques of verification, and in section III, entitled "The role of the United Nations and its Member States in the field of verification", there is a listing of proposals for consideration at the third special session devoted to disarmament.

This three-part report represents in its own right an important and realistic contribution to the subject of verification, and advances international understanding of this matter. Also, I think the report is an excellent example of the concrete and valuable work the Disarmament Commission can undertake and accomplish. Moreover, it is a significant contribution to the work of the third
special session devoted to disarmament. I believe it can be said that the
consideration of verification at the third special session will now be started on a
very positive basis as a result of this consensus report.

I want to express my appreciation first of all to the Secretariat staff, who
did a tremendous job all through our work in considering this item, and
particularly to Mr. Lin, the Secretary of the Commission, who served also as
Secretary of the Working Group. I am very indebted to him.

I want to express my appreciation to all delegations for their business-like
and co-operative approach in the preparation of this report and the successful
conclusion of our consideration of the item.

Finally, I should note that the consensus achieved was the result of a strong
desire for consensus that permeated our discussions. So it is all members of the
Working Group who should share in this success.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the Disarmament Commission wishes to adopt
the report of Working Group IV on item 10, regarding verification in all its
aspects, as contained in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.9, as orally revised.

The report, as orally revised, was adopted.
The CHAIRMAN: Next, in my capacity as Chairman of the Consultation Group on agenda item 11, regarding confidence-building measures, I wish to introduce the Group's report (A/CN.10/1988/CRP.10).

I wish first to draw attention to some changes on page 2. First, in paragraph 6 the word "Draft" should be deleted at the beginning of the heading which now begins "Draft guidelines ...".

Next, the first sentence of the second paragraph under that heading should now read:

"The text of the guidelines is agreed on all counts."

The rest of that paragraph and the following paragraph - in other words, down to the word "entirety" - should be deleted.

The Consultation Group had a total of six meetings during this session. In the course of consideration of the subject, the Group concentrated its efforts on the three outstanding paragraphs - paragraphs 2.3.3, 2.3.4 and 2.3.6 - in annex II of the Commission's 1986 report (A/41/42), entitled "Draft guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for the implementation of such measures on a global or regional level".

A goodly number of proposals were put forward with a view to reaching agreement on a consensus text. With a spirit of compromise by all delegations, the Group was able to achieve agreement on a consensus text in its entirety on the draft guidelines. Therefore, the Consultation Group concluded its consideration of the agenda item and fulfilled the mandate entrusted by the General Assembly in its resolution 42/39 F. I shall say a little more about this later, but let me say now that I wish to express my sincere thanks to all delegations and to the Secretariat for the co-operation they gave in assisting the Group to reach a consensus text.

Are there any comments?
Mr. FAN Guoxiang (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation has noted that at this year's and last year's sessions we have concentrated on the discussion of paragraphs 2.3.3, 2.3.4 and 2.3.6. We have also noted, Sir, that under your guidance we have achieved consensus on those three paragraphs. We have no difficulties in that regard.

However, the Chinese delegation believes that we should also take note of paragraph 2.3.5, which I understand everyone accepts. It reads as follows:

(spoke in English)

"A detailed universal model being obviously impractical, confidence-building measures must be tailored to specific situations. The effectiveness of a concrete measure will increase the more it is adjusted to the specific perceptions of threat or the confidence requirements of a given situation or a particular region."

The CHAIRMAN: This was an oversight by the Chairman. We discussed it at the beginning of our Consultation Group meetings, and it was agreed that the paragraph was adopted and should not be considered in the process. I thank the representative of China for pointing that out. The Chair takes note, and it will be reflected in the report.

Mr. von STULPNAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany): I think it will be recalled that the Group agreed that paragraphs 2.3.5 and 2.3.6 should change positions.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. That will also be reflected in the report.

May I take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report of the Consultation Group on item 11, contained in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.10, as orally amended?

The report, as orally amended, was adopted.
The CHAIRMAN: I now turn to the draft special report of the Disarmament
Commission itself, which is contained in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.2. I have
pleasure in calling on the Rapporteur of the Commission, Mr. Istav Sipos,
representative of Hungary, to introduce the draft special report.

Mr. SIPOS (Hungary), Rapporteur: It is my pleasure and honour to
introduce the draft special report of the Disarmament Commission
(A/CN.10/1988/CRP.2. The draft report is in accordance with General Assembly
resolution 42/42 G It contains three chapters: I. Introduction; II. Organization
of work of the Commission since 1982; III. Work of the Commission at its
substantive sessions from 1983 to 1988. The document contains all the work of the
Commission since 1982.
(Mr. Sipos, Rapporteur)

The general structure of this special report of the Commission is more or less similar to that of the report submitted to the second special session devoted to disarmament in 1982, as contained in document A/S-12/3, with some modification in the light of the increased number of agenda items and subsidiary bodies as well as the state of deliberations on the substantive agenda items since then. Moreover, I wish to point out that this special report has been prepared in the form of a factual description of all subjects that have been considered by the Disarmament Commission since 1983 with extensive references to the annual reports and documents issued. As in 1982, a list of documents issued by the Commission will be attached to the special report as annex I. Due to the heavy workload of the Secretariat, that document can be available only tomorrow morning. Other annexes will also be added as appropriate.

With this brief introduction, I recommend this draft special report to the Commission for adoption.

Finally, I should like to express my sincere thanks to the Secretariat: first to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Yasushi Akashi; to the Secretary of the Disarmament Commission, Mr. Kuo-Chung Lin; and the Secretaries of all subsidiary bodies from the Department for Disarmament Affairs, for their valuable co-operation in preparing this draft special report to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish now to take up agenda item 13, namely, report of the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly at its forty-third session.

Paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 42/42G requests the Disarmament Commission to meet for a period not exceeding four weeks during 1988 and to submit a substantive special report containing specific recommendations on the items included in its agenda to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, as well as a report to the Assembly at its forty-third session.
Therefore, this year the Disarmament Commission was requested by the General Assembly to prepare two reports, one special report to the third special session and another report to the regular session of the Assembly.

Members of the Commission may recall that in 1982 there was a similar situation. That is, the Disarmament Commission submitted a special report to the second special session devoted to disarmament in May, as contained in document A/S-12/3, and prepared its annual report after the second special session so as to incorporate the decisions of the special session as well as its own recommendations into the annual report. Thus, the Commission held a brief session with one plenary meeting and adopted its annual report, as contained in document A/37/42, on 14 October 1982.

Bearing in mind that the previous practice could be the guidance for the Commission's preparation of its reports this year, at the Commission's Bureau meeting held on Friday afternoon, 13 May, the Chairman brought up this question and it was decided that a brief session of the Commission could be held with one or two meetings in October this year, immediately prior to the First Committee session, to consider and adopt its annual report to the forty-third session of the General Assembly, taking into account, in particular, the decisions and recommendations of the third special session relating to the work of the Commission as well as the requests by the forty-second session of the General Assembly in its resolutions on some items contained in the Commission's agenda. As I emphasized before, such a brief session of one or two meetings will not entail any financial implications because it could be taken care of within existing resources.

However, after the consultations I conducted during the past few days, several delegations suggested the adoption of the annual report of the Commission simultaneously with the special report this week, which, in that respect, is a
deviation from past practice. Therefore, I should now like to put the question before the Commission for a decision. I should point out that it was not a decision, but it was past practice. I do not want to elaborate on the point I have just made; I merely gave members all of that background information to make the point that I am making now. If the Commission decided to adopt its annual report now, it would be on the understanding that should the third special session adopt decisions and recommendations in connection with agenda items of the Commission, the Bureau would decide in late June to hold a brief session of the Commission in October to consider them as a follow-up measure and adopt its recommendations to the forty-third session of the General Assembly. These recommendations would then be issued as an addendum to the annual report of the Disarmament Commission. If that is the case, we may adopt the annual report at the same time that we adopt the special report.

I shall now call on those members who wish to speak specifically to the last point that I made. As there are no comments, the Commission will adopt the annual report tomorrow and, after the special session, the Bureau will meet to determine whether there are any recommendations from the third special session to be submitted as an addendum. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Commission agrees to that procedure.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to remind members that the time-limit for the list of speakers for concluding statements is 6 p.m. today.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.