



General Assembly

UNITED NATIONS
DEPARTMENT FOR DISARMAMENT AFFAIRS
REFERENCE LIBRARY

Distr.
GENERAL

A/CN.10/PV.130
24 May 1988

ENGLISH

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 20 May 1988, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

- Special report of the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly at its third special session devoted to disarmament (continued)
- Reports of subsidiary bodies (continued)
- Report of the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly at its forty-third session

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

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

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

REPORTS OF SUBSIDIARY BODIES (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: At the 129th plenary meeting, held yesterday afternoon, 19 May, the Disarmament Commission adopted all reports of its subsidiary bodies, except the report of Working Group II on agenda item 7 regarding the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament (A/CN.10/1988/CRP.6). Because the Working Group did not conclude its work by adopting a report as scheduled, documents in connection with its work could not be produced on time. This morning all the relevant documents relating to Working Group II have been distributed in all languages. Therefore, I should now like to take up for consideration the report of Working Group II on agenda item 7, as contained in conference room paper A/CN.10/1988/CRP.6 and Corr. 1 and 2.

May I take it that the Disarmament Commission wishes to adopt the report of its Working Group II on agenda item 7 (A/CN.10/1988/CRP.6 and Corr.1 and 2)?

The report was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Commission having adopted all the reports of its subsidiary bodies, I should now like to take up the special report of the Commission as contained in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.2 for consideration. The Rapporteur has already introduced the special report, so I now wish to consider it paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 10 were adopted seriatim.

The CHAIRMAN: Under the heading "C. Rules of procedure" I should like to read out the amended paragraphs 11 and 12 as they will now appear, as follows:

"11. Paragraph 118 (b) of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly (see para. 3 above) laid down the basis of the rules of procedure for the Disarmament Commission. It should be noted that the Commission has particularly observed the principle of consensus in making its decisions during the entire period of its substantive sessions from 1982 to 1988.

"12. During the 1988 substantive session, the Disarmament Commission, at its 125th meeting on 3 May 1988, decided to retain the services of verbatim records for the Commission by a vote of 43 in favour to 5 against. The Chairman stated:

'A precedent is not being set, but we have certain rules and procedures within our jurisdiction and we try to use them whenever possible.'

(see A/CN.10/PV.125 and 126).

Paragraphs 11 and 12, as amended, were adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come then to "D. Secretariat and services for the Commission".

Paragraphs 13 and 14 were adopted seriatim.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments on paragraph 15?

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to propose some changes to the end of this paragraph. It seems to us that there are two points to be noted here that are not entirely appropriate to the proper functioning of the Organization.

I note that we speak of "all entitlements and full conference services". I think that these are entirely inappropriate references. There are cases in which limited services, half or three-quarter services, are provided and it seems preferable to us simply to say "services" and not to give the idea in a formal text that there are definite patterns of services to be made available. The expression "is entitled" should be challenged. This presupposes a kind of legal basis for this statement. I do not believe that we should lend support to that idea. To simplify this matter I would recommend that the text should simply state:

"During the 1988 session, services, notably conference services, for the Commission were restored",
and then the bracket refers to the relevant decisions. I think it would be better to put this in simpler terms rather than lend credence to misleading or erroneous ideas.

Secondly, I propose that we should add a sentence referring to the fact that in certain cases we have observed that these restored services were not used to the full. I must say that after the concern we expressed last year, which was expressed in the report of the Commission last year, we appreciated the effort made

(Mr. Morel, France)

this year and that is significant. Simply, we regretted that in some cases, when it would have been possible to meet in rooms with full conference services, these possibilities were not used to the full. That is why we should recommend for the future that these services should be used.

I add here that I must express opposition to the idea that in certain cases it would be better to do our work in smaller rooms and that somehow the success of our work was affected by the the size of the room in which we met. The actual work of certain working groups - for example, the working group on verification - revealed that we could be very successful when meeting in a room with conference services. Therefore, I do not think we should lend credence to this parallelism between the work we do and the size of the room in which we do it.

Having said that, I suggest that the following sentence be added after the one I have just referred to with my changes:

"However, in future it would be desirable to ensure that translation and interpretation services made available to the Commission should be fully utilized."

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further comments on paragraph 15, I now submit for decision the first proposal made by the representative of France, namely that in the last sentence of paragraph 15 the words "all entitlements and full" should be deleted. If I hear no objection to that proposal, I shall take it that the Commission is in favour of the amendment.

The amendment was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The second amendment is to include the sentence he indicated, which is:

"However, in future it would be desirable to ensure that translation and interpretation services made available to the Commission should be fully utilized."

(The Chairman)

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Commission agrees to this amendment.

The amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 15, as amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come to "E. Documentation".

Paragraph 16 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments on paragraph 17?

Mr. TOMASZEWSKI (Poland): In October last year the ministers for foreign affairs of the States members of the Warsaw Treaty adopted a document on the need to increase the effectiveness of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. That document has been issued as a document of the forty-second session of the General Assembly under the symbol A/42/708 and Corr.1. Being fully aware of the need for, and guided by the spirit of, economy measures, we have not asked for a separate issuance of this document as a document of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, but I should like to place on record today the relevance of that document to the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: Your point is taken and it will be reflected in the verbatim records.

Paragraphs 17 and 18 were adopted seriatim.

The CHAIRMAN: We come to "F. Participation of non-governmental organizations".

Paragraph 19 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come to "III. WORK OF THE COMMISSION AT ITS SUBSTANTIVE SESSIONS FROM 1983 TO 1988: A. Agenda of the Commission at its substantive sessions".

Paragraph 20 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn next to paragraph 21.

Mr. FARMY (Egypt): I understand what we are trying to say in this paragraph; however, I am not sure we are expressing it well. When we say, as stated there, "that the agenda should be kept as short and practical as possible", we may implicitly be setting out criteria for agenda items and I do not think we should be doing that. I do not want to draft anything new; therefore, I suggest that we delete the words "and practical".

The CHAIRMAN: That formulation appears in previous documentation and I think it is a matter of tradition to include it. The point of the representative of Egypt is well taken, and if there is no objection to deleting those words we can do so.

If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It is so decided.

Paragraph 21, as amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come now to "B. Consideration of the substantive items 10/ 1. Nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament (a) Consideration of the subject from 1983 to 1987".

Mr. WHITESIDE (United Kingdom): I wish to comment on footnote 10/, which reads:

"The short titles used in this section refer to the subject-matter of the agenda items and have been adopted for the sake of convenience ...".

I understand that sentence to mean that they have been adopted for use in this report, rather than adopted in the more formal sense in which that word is used in the United Nations. I wanted to make that clearer and wondered whether it might not be better to - and this is my specific suggestion - delete the words "and have been adopted" and substitute "and are here used". The second line of the footnote would then read: "agenda items and are here used for the sake of convenience..."

The CHAIRMAN: Again, I draw attention to the fact that that was the exact wording adopted at the last special session. If delegations wish to accept your suggestion that can be done.

If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): My delegation has no objection to using certain abbreviated formulations for the sake of convenience, provided those abbreviations accurately reflect the sense of the broader formulations that appear elsewhere. My delegation does not believe that the abbreviated version of the item under B. 1 is accurate: it does not reflect the full scope of agenda item 4, "Consideration of various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race..." and "Consideration ... a general approach to negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament". So the item does not deal only with the so-called nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament.

I respectfully request that the Secretariat produce perhaps an abbreviated version of the substance of agenda item 4, but one that would accurately reflect the meaning and scope of that item.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that a special request? What we are doing is simply following what we did in 1982; those were the same words used then.

What I suggest is that the representative of the United States submit his suggestion to the Secretariat for inclusion at some later stage, rather than our doing it now. Is that acceptable to the representative of the United States?

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): If we made mistakes in the past that does not mean we should repeat them. Since this report will be submitted to the third special session devoted to disarmament, it should accurately reflect the full scope of our work from 1982. As I have said, the description of agenda

(Mr. Akalovsky, United States)

item 4, as formulated under B. 1, page 8, of the draft report, does not reflect the meaning and full scope of that agenda item.

The CHAIRMAN: I agree with your point of view about mistakes.

Do you have a formulation to reflect it fully so that we may deal with it now?

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): No, I do not, Mr. Chairman. My suggestion was that the Secretariat could perhaps produce one; it should not take too long. We could hold that in abeyance until the Secretariat is able to produce one.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall therefore go on to paragraph 23.

Paragraph 23 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We go next to paragraph 24.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): We have the same problem with regard to paragraph 24, which reads:

"From the 1984 to 1987 sessions of the Commission, the subject of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament was continuously considered..."

The CHAIRMAN: We shall look into that also.

We shall therefore pass on to paragraph 25.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): Yesterday the representative of Colombia made a comment similar to mine in connection with a Working Group's report. The Contact Group's report on agenda item 4 contains only one recommendation, namely, that the work be continued next year. The text reads "... and recommendations contained therein..."; it should be "recommendation".

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you; that will be reflected in the paragraph.

Paragraph 25 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come next to "2. Reduction of military budgets:

(a) Consideration of the subject from 1983 to 1987", paragraph 26.

Paragraph 26 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Next, we come to paragraph 27.

Paragraph 27 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now consider paragraph 28.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I have a comment on the sentence beginning "That paragraph dealt with ...". I suggest the following slight amendment: After the phrase "and availability of meaningful and reliable data" insert a comma and add "especially"; the phrase would now read: "and availability of meaningful and reliable data, especially through the use".

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments?

Mr. KRASULIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have an objection to making such an addition in so far as these additions are not based on any conclusions of the Group which dealt with this question. Therefore we cannot agree with this proposal.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I would respectfully submit that the sentence as it is now does not reflect the outcome of the work of the Working Group on the reduction of military budgets either, because the paragraph the Working Group had under discussion talked about the principles of transparency and comparability and also about the availability of meaningful and reliable data in general and the need for such availability. And then there was another sentence which was not fully agreed and which talked about a particular and, at least from our standpoint, essential need to use the reporting system that exists in the United Nations for that purpose.

(Mr. Akalovsky, United States)

I was careful enough not to use the phrase that was not agreed, namely, "an essential step" or "first step", but it seems to me that the sentence should read in such a way as would indicate that the availability of meaningful and reliable data should not be only through the use of that reporting system.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to ask the United States representative for a point of clarification. If it should not only be "through the use", then what is the point of reference for "especially"?

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I am not wedded to the word "especially", but it seems to me that we ought to indicate that data can be made available not only through the United Nations reporting system, although this is an essential step in our view. It can be made available through other means as well. The United States makes available its data on military spending not only through the United Nations reporting system. So perhaps we could say "in particular" if "especially" is objectionable.

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objection then I shall take it that "in particular" is acceptable.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Cuba.

Mr. NUÑEZ-MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Perhaps it might be better to eliminate this entire sentence from the paragraph, retaining the previous sentence ending with the words "except for paragraph 7." and continuing with the next sentence beginning with "Various proposals", since it appears that that sentence mentions a principle of comparability that is not mentioned in that paragraph. It might be better, therefore, simply to eliminate that entire sentence from the paragraph, and we might need a little time in order to consider what should remain.

The CHAIRMAN: The point made by the representative of Cuba is that this sentence beginning with the words "That paragraph dealt with" and concluding with "resolution 35/142 B" should be deleted. Do I hear any objections to this?

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I thought "in particular" was acceptable to everybody. I heard no objections on the part of anyone, and furthermore it seems to me that it would be useful to the reader to know what paragraph 7 is all about, because the following sentence says "Various proposals in this regard" - what regard? - "were put forward...". It seems to me that the substance of the paragraph ought to be summarized in this sense. As I said earlier, I did not hear any objection to the words "in particular".

The CHAIRMAN: I had taken the decision by the time I saw the hand of the representative of Cuba, and at this moment I would like to ask him please to co-operate with us and leave this paragraph in. It may be studied in great detail for next year and then he could make even better comments as to what it should be and then perhaps even this entire paragraph could go. So I would ask the representative of Cuba to co-operate and let us adopt the paragraph with the inclusion of the words "in particular".

I thank him for his kind co-operation.

Paragraph 28, as orally amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to paragraph 29. If there are no comments, I shall take it that it is adopted.

Paragraph 29 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Next, we shall take up "(b), Present state of deliberations and recommendations at the 1988 session", paragraph 30.

Mr. FAHMY (Egypt): Just a note for the Secretariat. As long as we are going to edit with regard to plural or singular on "recommendations", could this be done throughout the paper instead of our having to ask to speak each time?

The CHAIRMAN: That is understood. Thank you.

Paragraph 30 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Next, we take up paragraph 31. Are there any comments?

Paragraph 31 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We now come to paragraph 32.

Ms. TAYLOR (United Kingdom: My comment relates to the sentence beginning on line 6, in which we speak of the "differences of view among delegations". I am happy to be able to say that the area of our differences is somewhat narrower than the sentence would suggest, and in line with that I would like to suggest a slight modification to the end of the sentence, the entire sentence to read as follows:

"In the course of deliberations, differences of view among delegations centred on some fundamental concepts and elements emphasized in that text, particularly South Africa's nuclear-weapons capability and its verifiability."

The CHAIRMAN: Is everyone clear on the amendment suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom in paragraph 32: "South Africa's nuclear weapons capability and its verifiability"?

Mr. ADAM (Sudan): My delegation believes that in past years we always dealt with South Africa's nuclear capability and the question of verifying South Africa's capability, was only a part of our deliberations when we were dealing with the question of South Africa's nuclear capability. Thus, I do not think it desirable that we should put it in this part of the report where we are dealing mainly with South Africa's nuclear capability and the differences came about in that area only.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): I have studied paragraph 32 and the amendment to it submitted by the United Kingdom and I would commend it to the Commission. I am very much at one with our colleague from Sudan in the purposes to which he has just given expression, but if one looks at all of paragraph 32 it becomes clear that we were indeed considering all aspects of the nuclear capability of South Africa, as we should, including those aspects relating to its unsafeguarded nuclear programme. But in this particular sentence to which the representative of the United Kingdom has drawn attention, we are highlighting the particular parts of that programme that were the subject of main differences among delegations. It says:

"... differences of view among delegations centred on some fundamental concepts and elements emphasized in that text,".

I think that of those central or fundamental concepts it is true, as suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom, that one of the central ones was the weapons capability. To me, the amendment proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom does not suggest that the other aspects of its nuclear capability

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

are not important. If that is what it suggests, then I could not support it, but I do not take it as suggesting that, but just in this particular sentence highlighting the central problem of the nuclear weapons capability, and in that sense I think the amendment is supportable.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): My delegation would also like to support very strongly the amendment suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom for the reasons just expressed so well by the representative of Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you also in agreement with what he said to the effect that if it refers to something else it cannot be accepted? I think that is a point the representative of the United Kingdom will have to clarify.

Ms. TAYLOR (United Kingdom): I am very happy to clarify that we also could not accept it if it had the alternative sense. What we are saying is that we are in agreement about a great deal in connection with this subject and our difference is only in a very narrow area. Therefore, the interpretation put on it by the representative of Australia is perfectly correct.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is pleased to hear about the narrowing of differences based on this particular question, so I would like to ask the representative of the United Kingdom to read the amendment once more so that we all know clearly where it comes before we take further action.

Ms. TAYLOR (United Kingdom): It would be towards the end of line 7:

"... particularly South Africa's nuclear weapons capability and its verifiability."

The CHAIRMAN: I trust the representative of Sudan can accept the explanations given?

Mr. ADAM (Sudan): I have a very simple question to ask: Do we consider that South Africa has nuclear capability but we are unable to verify it? That is my problem.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. I do not think that is a question that we can get into for discussion now. It is a very valid one. I think this was discussed within the Working Group itself and I do not think it is something we can do at this stage.

The representative of Sudan gave an indication previously that this information might go somewhere else. I am merely proceeding on the basis of the explanations given by the persons who evidently or supposedly attended these meetings, and I wonder whether the representative of Sudan could accept this as a view of the narrowing of differences that may have been observed within the whole process? This is all I am trying to say.

The representative of Sudan's point about the capability is one of the questions that we have always been dealing with. Would the representative of Sudan like a moment to discuss this? I will give him some time on this and we will go on to paragraph 33, under the subheading "(b) Present state of deliberations and recommendations at the 1988 session".

Paragraph 33 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now take "4. Recommendations contained in the report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues entitled 'Common Security'" - paragraphs 34 to 37.

Paragraphs 34 to 37 were adopted seriatim.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now consider "5. Guidelines for confidence-building measures: (a) Consideration of the subject from 1983 to 1987" - paragraphs 38 to 40.

Paragraphs 38 to 40 were adopted seriatim.

The CHAIRMAN: Now subheading "(b) Present state of deliberations and recommendations at the 1988 session" - paragraph 41.

Are there any comments on paragraph 41 with the change indicated by the representatives of Egypt and the United States? As I hear none, I take it that the Commission wishes to adopt paragraph 41.

Paragraph 41, as amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come now to subheading 6: Relationship between disarmament and development" - paragraphs 42 to 44.

Paragraphs 42 to 44 were adopted seriatim.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I apologize that I do not have that particular report before me. Perhaps the Secretariat could cite, at least for the benefit of my delegation, whether it was actually the Commission's recommendation to convene a conference on the relationship between disarmament and development was what prompted the convening of this conference? As I recall, it was a proposal made by a particular State and I am not sure whether it actually was the Commission's initiative or recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN: It was a proposal, as I understand it, made in the Commission.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): My question is whether it was the Commission's proposal or recommendation. I do not believe that that is the case. I should like the Secretariat to inform us as to whether the international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development was convened upon a recommendation or proposal by the Disarmament Commission, or as a result of some other initiative.

The CHAIRMAN: We will get back to the representative of the United States on that matter.

Section III.B.7(a) deals with the "Role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament: consideration of the subject from 1985 to 1987".

We shall consider paragraph 45.

Paragraph 45 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now consider paragraph 46.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I have a comment on the sentence in paragraph 46 reading: "As a result, the Working Group was able to agree upon some of the recommendations".

We do not believe that corresponds to fact. The paper was not agreed upon, and of course we proceed on the principle, as it were, that nothing is agreed upon until everything is agreed upon. So I would suggest that that sentence be replaced by another sentence reading: "However, the Working Group was unable to agree upon the recommendations and included an unagreed working paper as an annex to its report."

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments on that suggestion?

Mr. TOMASZEWSKI (Poland): I think the new wording partially reflects the efforts of our group in previous years, especially last year, but I think that we should put it in a positive rather than a negative way. I would propose the wording: "As a result, the Working Group decided to include an unagreed paper as an annex to its report".

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, the proposal will be adopted.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now move to paragraph 47.

Mr. TOMASZEWSKI (Poland): With regard to paragraph 47, at the end of the first sentence, since the practical work occurred in the contact group, which is mentioned in paragraph 46 but only in context of last year's work, I would like to add, after the words "working group," the words: "which re-established the contact group for that purpose". The sentence would then read:

"During its 1988 substantive session, the Disarmament Commission again considered this subject in a working group, which re-established the contact group for that purpose."

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to that amendment?

Paragraph 47, as amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments with regard to paragraphs 48, 49, 50 and 51 (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) under "Curbing the naval arms race"? and "Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade"?

Paragraphs 48 through 50 were adopted seriatim.

Paragraph 51 was provisionally adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come now to section 10, "Naval armaments and disarmament, (a) Consideration of the subject in 1986 and 1987." Are there any comments on paragraph 52? Paragraph 53?

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I would request that the language of paragraph 53 be brought into conformity with the description of the work on this agenda item in your report on your consultations, namely, that during its 1986 and 1987 sessions the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission conducted, under his own responsibility, consultations, and so forth, as stated in your report.

The CHAIRMAN: Your point is well taken, but I should like to point out that that is expressed in the third line of paragraph 53. If we were to insert it at the beginning as well it might be redundant.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I was not suggesting that we repeat the same thought twice. It should be expressed only once -

The CHAIRMAN: You prefer it at the beginning?

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): That is right, because we all know that not all delegations, and not the Commission per se, considered the item.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That change will be reflected. Are there any further comments?

Paragraphs 52 and 53 were adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to (b), "Present state of deliberations and recommendations at the 1988 session." Are there any comments on paragraph 54?

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I am not sure that the report itself contains any recommendation. It is the working paper that contains the recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments on paragraph 54? If not, may I take it that paragraph 54, as amended, is adopted?

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): What amendment are you referring to, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: You had noted that it was the working paper, and not the report.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): My suggestion was that the words "and recommendations contained therein regarding agenda item 8" be deleted, because the Commission did not adopt the Chairman's working paper.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank you for that clarification. Are there any further comments? The paragraph will therefore read:

"...the Commission adopted the report of the Chairman regarding agenda item 8".

If there are no objections, I shall take it that the Commission adopts paragraph 54, as orally amended.

Paragraph 54, as orally amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to paragraph 55.

Mr. NANNA (Nigeria): I am aware that we are considering paragraph 55 on page 15 of the draft special report. I do not intend to take us back to that paragraph, Mr. Chairman. I apologize but, unfortunately, the English language is not my first language, but only my first working language.

I had some difficulty in understanding the full meaning of the first sentence in paragraph 51. I have been reading it over and over since yesterday evening, and I felt, in accordance with the comment you made earlier this morning, that I should seek clarification. The paragraph reads:

"During its 1985 session, the Disarmament Commission considered this item in plenary meetings and thereafter the Chairman of the Commission undertook the task of elaborating a report on the item in consultations with 'his friends' and other interested delegations."

My recollection was that during the 1985 session of the Disarmament Commission there were actually consultations under the chairmanship of Ambassador Mgbokwere of Nigeria. I do not know if this sentence reflects that meaning.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have a suggestion as to how it might reflect it? Could you give us a formulation as to how it would reflect what you think it ought?

Mr. NANNA (Nigeria): I am not offering any formulation at this time, but I was attempting to explain that during the 1985 session of the Disarmament Commission this subject - the mid-term review of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade - was taken up in a consultation group and that a report was compiled under the chairmanship of Ambassador Mgbokwere of Nigeria. That is a fact.

I am asking whether this sentence will reflect that situation. If it does, then I have no problem.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to including the comment made by the representative of Nigeria? If not, it will be included.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up paragraph 55.

Paragraph 55 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come now to paragraph 56.

Mr. MELLBIN (Denmark): I would propose a small amendment to make the text of paragraph 56 fully reflect the pertinent facts of the deliberations as they transpired in 1987. In line 8 of that paragraph, after the word "forward", I propose the insertion of the following words: "and a comprehensive draft report was presented by the Chairman".

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to the additional words proposed by the representative of Denmark? If not, they will be included.

It was so decided.

Paragraph 56 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come now to paragraph 57, under the heading "Present state of deliberations and recommendations at the 1988 session".

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I should like again to draw attention to the word "recommendations". I shall not repeat my comments, since I take it, as was suggested earlier, that the Secretariat will review all the references and recommendations to see whether they should be in the singular or the plural.

Paragraph 57 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the paragraphs under the heading "12. Verification in all its aspects (a) Consideration of the subject in 1987", beginning with paragraph 58.

Paragraph 58 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come now to paragraph 59.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): In paragraph 59, in the sentence beginning on its fourteenth line, I would suggest that the words "on the three major parts of the subject" be deleted so that the sentence reads:

"As a result, the Working Group was able to achieve agreement on a set of recommendations."

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to the deletion proposed by the representative of the United States?

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): This paragraph refers to the work in 1987, last year. I rather think it is correctly formulated as it stands.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Canada is correct: there are three parts.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): Certainly I am not disputing that the report has three parts, but the fact is that in the third part there is simply a list of ideas and proposals and an explicit statement that they were not agreed upon, that there was no consensus. To be fully accurate, I think the sentence should end with the word "recommendations". Which recommendations have been agreed upon, or not agreed upon, will be clear from the text.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the representative of Canada wish to speak to this point?

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): You will have to give me a minute, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall give you five.

We come now to paragraph 60, under the heading "Present state of deliberations and recommendations at the 1988 session".

Paragraph 60 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come now to those paragraphs under the heading "Special report of the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly at its third special session devoted to disarmament", beginning with paragraph 61.

Paragraph 61 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come now to paragraph 62.

Mr. FAHMY (Egypt): I suggest that the words "by it" be inserted after the words "all those recommendations made" in order to make it clear that it is the recommendations of the Disarmament Commission that are referred to here.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Commission wish to adopt paragraph 62 as orally amended?

Paragraph 62, as orally amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 63 refers to additional proposals recommended by the Disarmament Commission; as there are none, may I take it the Commission decides to delete paragraph 63?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to the footnotes appearing on page 17 of document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.2.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): With respect to footnote 10, concerning the titles of agenda items as used in section B, I fully agree with the earlier remark by the representative of the United Kingdom that the formulation "have been adopted" is not appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN: In connection with the question raised by the representative of the United States, I shall now read out a formulation proposed by the Secretariat for the title of section B of chapter III:

"Various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, as well as a general approach to negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament".

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): My delegation finds that formulation acceptable.

I wish also to note that my delegation reserves its position with respect to paragraph 53, pending the development of a formulation according with the language of the report.

The CHAIRMAN: Returning to paragraph 32, may I ask the representative of Sudan whether the clarifications given with respect to the amendment by the United Kingdom are acceptable to his delegation?

Mr. ADAM (Sudan): My delegation accepts the amendment proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom with the understanding that attention will be given to my earlier question in future meetings of the Disarmament Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: May I take it, then, that the Commission wishes to adopt paragraph 32, as orally amended?

Paragraph 32, as orally amended, was adopted.

Mr. NANNA (Nigeria): Before we conclude our consideration of the report, I would be interested to know what formulation the Secretariat now has for paragraph 51, reflecting the position as I explained it.

The CHAIRMAN: It was my understanding that the representative of Nigeria had requested that the name of the Chairman of the Contact Group be included in that paragraph. Could he now suggest a formulation?

Mr. NANNA (Nigeria): The first sentence would read:

"During its 1985 session, the Disarmament Commission considered this item in plenary meetings and thereafter the Chairman of the Commission undertook the task of elaborating a report on the item in a Contact Group under the chairmanship of Ambassador Mgbokwere and other interested delegations".

The emphasis is on the Contact Group under the chairmanship of Ambassador Mgbokwere.

The CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken, but I do not think we can include the name; that is not a policy that we have followed. I suggest that we delete the name, but the formulation about the Contact Group will be included.

Paragraph 51, as orally amended, was adopted.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): Since we have adopted a relatively short formulation for describing item 4 in the heading on page 8 under paragraph 21, and since we have a similar problem in paragraph 24, I suggest that for the sake of simplicity we say at the beginning of paragraph 24:

"From the 1984 to 1987 sessions of the Commission, the subject was continuously considered ..."

and drop the description. We do not need it.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think we can say "was continuously considered". That does not sound appropriate.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): That is in the text now.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not always agree with the language of the text. Based on what the representative of the United States said, it did not seem to read properly. Perhaps he would read it out for me again.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I was simply suggesting that we delete the phrase "of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament", as was done in paragraph 23. We can say that the subject was considered; I hold no brief

(Mr. Akalovsky, United States)

for the word "continuously". If you do not like it, Mr. Chairman, we are perfectly agreeable to deleting it.

The CHAIRMAN: Then the first sentence of paragraph 24 would read:

"From the 1984 to 1987 sessions of the Commission, the subject was continuously considered by a Contact Group ...".

The oral amendment was adopted.

The paragraph, as orally amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other paragraphs to be dealt with?

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Have we taken a decision on paragraph 59, Sir? If so, what was it?

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): It is my understanding that paragraph 59 was adopted without any changes.

The CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

We have now adopted all the paragraphs of the draft, so we shall now take up the draft special report of the Commission as a whole, with all reports of the subsidiary bodies inserted.

May I take it that it is the Commission's wish to adopt the draft special report of the Commission as a whole, as amended (A/CN.10/1988/CRP.2)?

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): My delegation is prepared to adopt the draft report, with the one reservation that I stated earlier with regard to paragraph 53.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not want to use the word "trust", but I shall use it anyway. Will the representative of the United States trust me? It will be done.

May I take it that it is the Commission's wish to adopt the draft special report of the Commission as a whole, as amended (A/CN.10/1988/CRP.2), and with the clarification just made by the representative of the United States? I do not have

(The Chairman)

the words in my head, and I do not want to hold up the proceedings to find them, but we shall comply with his request.

The draft special report as a whole, as amended, was adopted.

REPORT OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS FORTY-THIRD SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: At its 129th plenary meeting held yesterday, 19 May, the Commission decided to consider its annual report at this session in May, together with the special report, to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-third session. It was understood that should the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament adopt decisions and recommendations in connection with agenda items of the Commission, the Commission's Bureau would decide in late June to hold a brief session in October to consider those recommendations as a follow-up measure. With such an understanding, I wish now to take up agenda item 13 - Consideration and adoption of the Commission's draft annual report (A/CN.10/1988/CRP.11), which has been distributed.

I have the pleasure of once again calling on the Rapporteur, Mr. Istvan Sipos, representative of Hungary, to introduce the draft annual report.

Mr. SIPOS (Hungary), Rapporteur: I have the pleasure and honour to introduce the draft annual report of the Disarmament Commission (A/CN.10/1988/CRP.11), which has been distributed to members of the Commission. This draft report is prepared in accordance with General Assembly resolution 42/42 G. As in previous years, it contains four chapters: I. Introduction; II. Organization and work of the 1988 session; III. Documentation; and IV. Conclusions and recommendations.

In this regard, I wish to point out that this year chapter IV, dealing with conclusions and recommendations, contains recommendations only in general terms, since the specific recommendations in connection with the work of the subsidiary

(Mr. Sipos, Rapporteur)

bodies are incorporated into the special report of the Commission to the General Assembly at its third special session devoted to disarmament for its consideration. Moreover, as decided by the Commission at its 129th plenary meeting on 19 May, the understanding is that should the Commission hold a brief session in October this year its recommendations adopted at that time will be incorporated as an addendum to this annual report of the Commission for this session.

Having made these brief remarks, I recommend the draft annual report, as contained in document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.11, to the Disarmament Commission for adoption.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now consider the draft annual report paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1 was adopted.

Paragraph 2 (a)-(i) was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: In paragraph 2 (j) resolution 42/42 M is wrongly entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations ..." It should begin "Implementation of the recommendations ..."

Paragraph 2 (j), as orally amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 3 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come to "II. ORGANIZATION AND WORK OF THE 1988 SESSION".

Paragraphs 4 and 5 were adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 6 is the agenda. I am sure that if members look at it carefully they may find something with which they cannot agree, but if I do not hear any objections I will take it that paragraph 6 is adopted.

Paragraph 6 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments on paragraph 7?

Mr. CAPPAGLI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The third line of paragraph 7 refers to item 4 and I believe it would be appropriate to adjust the text to what was agreed for the special report, A/CN.10/1988/CRP.2, that is, to change the sentence which reads:

"With regard to item 4, concerning various aspects of the arms race and questions relating to both nuclear and conventional disarmament" and use the same method as is used in the special report.

The CHAIRMAN: I see no objection to that.

Paragraph 7 was adopted.

Paragraphs 8 and 9 were adopted seriatim.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any comment on paragraph 10?

Mr. TOMASZEWSKI (Poland): I have the same problem as I had with the special report. The paragraph mentions the work of the Working Group and that it held four meetings and a number of informal consultations between 4 and 18 May. It does not mention the Contact Group at all and I should like that to be reflected.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you like the same sentence as is in the special report to be included here?

Mr. TOMASZEWSKI (Poland): It cannot be the same sentence because there we are speaking of the re-establishment of the Contact Group. Here a Contact Group under Ambassador Richard Butler has been established and held so many meetings - I do not remember the number.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you leave it to the Secretariat? It will be included. Unless you have any special formulation the Secretariat will include that. Are there any other comments on that amendment?

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I have a factual correction. I think it is correct that the report of the Working Group shows five meetings from 4 to 19 May.

The CHAIRMAN: You are correct. Is there any other comment on this paragraph?

Paragraph 10 was adopted.

Paragraphs 11 to 15 were adopted seriatim.

The CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 16 will be changed to concord with what has been done in paragraphs 11 and 12 of the special report. I point that out now.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): Frankly, I do not think that a combination of paragraphs 11 and 12 of the special report would fit in here, because paragraph 11 talks about what happened over a period of time.

The CHAIRMAN: You are certainly correct. Forgive me. It is just paragraph 12. This paragraph will conform with paragraph 12. Is there any objection to that amendment?

Paragraph 16, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 17 and 18 were adopted seriatim.

The CHAIRMAN: We come to "III. DOCUMENTATION: A. Reports and other documents submitted by the Secretary-General".

Paragraphs 19 and 20 were adopted seriatim.

The CHAIRMAN: We come to "B. Other documents, including documents submitted by Member States".

Paragraphs 21 to 30 were adopted seriatim.

The CHAIRMAN: Next we come to "IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS".

Paragraph 31 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments on paragraph 32?

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I have some questions on this paragraph. Is it really appropriate for the Disarmament Commission to recommend that the General Assembly consider the decisions of the special session? It seems to me that it goes without saying that if the third special session devoted to disarmament makes certain recommendations the next session of the General Assembly will take them up. Is it up to the Commission to recommend or not to recommend? The language of this sentence suggests that we expect recommendations to be made, because it states:

"... recommended that the General Assembly, at its forty-third session, consider the decisions and recommendations adopted at its third special session devoted to disarmament in connection with the agenda items of the Disarmament Commission."

Then the next sentence says that if there are no decisions or recommendations then the General Assembly should do something else. Frankly I do not think this paragraph is required.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it is required. In the first part of the sentence where you have "At its ____ meeting", and so on, Members will remember that yesterday I went into a long explanation about the 1982 special session. It is for that reason that I wanted to clarify why we came to the decision that we might have to have another meeting for the third special session. The first sentence is

(The Chairman)

merely a clarification, which repeats what took place in 1982, to reflect what we discussed. The second sentence deals with the "if" part of it. I do not believe that anyone here considers that because we have said that, the third special session devoted to disarmament will come up with some recommendations. I hope so, but, in my understanding, that is not indicated here. I wish to state that the first sentence is merely a reflection of the 1982 special session. It does not pose a problem as far as I see it. However, I am in your hands.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): My delegation has no objection to the procedures you, Sir, outlined earlier today as to what the Disarmament Commission should do in case there are certain recommendations applicable to our work here that might be passed by the third special session devoted to disarmament. You, Sir, said that the Bureau would meet and would decide what to do. This paragraph does not deal with that issue. It talks about the next regular session of the General Assembly taking up the recommendations of the third special session, which to my mind goes without saying.

(Mr. Akalovsky, United States)

The text continues:

"The Commission further recommended that should the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament make no decisions or recommendations on the special report ... all the recommendations contained therein be resubmitted to the forty-third session..." (ibid.)

However, those recommendations are in this report. If there are no further recommendations, what would we resubmit?

The CHAIRMAN: I repeat: we are not submitting anything. Yesterday I made a statement so as to allow us to arrive at this position and adopt this annual report today. My understanding is that the first sentence reflects that. It says:

"At its ___ meeting ... the Disarmament Commission recommended that the General Assembly, at its forty-third session, consider the decisions and" - that must be done; that is part of what we do every year -

"recommendations adopted at its third special session devoted to disarmament in connection with the agenda items of the Disarmament Commission." (ibid.) That is necessary in connection with all annual reports.

The second sentence is merely to state what we decided: if the third special session should make no recommendation and that also will be forwarded. There is no difficulty here.

Paragraph 32 was adopted.

Mr. DIMITROV (Bulgaria): I am sorry to revert to paragraph 31, but I should like some clarification from you, Mr. Chairman.

Why is there no mention of agenda item 8? There is of course no recommendation on item 8, but if my memory serves me well we did adopt the Chairman's report on that item. However, there is no mention of that fact in this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN: The reason agenda item 8 is not included is because paragraph 31 deals with reports adopted by consensus and there was no consensus on agenda item 8, so far as I understood it. Therefore, I do not think it should appear here.

Mr. DIMITROV (Bulgaria): I am speaking only about the Chairman's report on the procedural part of the work, which we did accept and adopt. We did not adopt the substantive part, which was previously annexed to this report but now appears as document A/CN.10/113. We certainly adopted four paragraphs containing the Chairman's report on agenda item 8.

The CHAIRMAN: I remember the reference made by the representative of Sweden to document A/CN.10/113. I need a minute to study that, because I understood we were speaking merely of consensus reports.

Is the representative of Bulgaria suggesting that another sentence be included here? Does he have a formulation?

It is included in paragraph 17, as follows:

"the report of the Chairman of the Commission on agenda item 8; the report of the Consultation Group ..."

Would that suffice?

Mr. DIMITROV (Bulgaria): It might suffice. But it is stated in section IV, entitled "Conclusions and recommendations":

"... the Disarmament Commission adopted by consensus the reports of its subsidiary bodies and the recommendations contained therein regarding agenda items 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11..." (ibid., para. 31)

In fact, however, the Disarmament Commission also adopted by consensus the Chairman's report on agenda item 8.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the point made by the representative of Bulgaria that we include agenda item 8 in paragraph 31?

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I wonder if we must say the same thing twice. As the Chairman pointed out, there is a reference in paragraph 17 to his report on agenda item 8. In paragraph 31 the reference is to adoption by consensus of reports of subsidiary bodies of the Commission - and, of course, the Chairman's consultations were not as a subsidiary body of the Commission.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I do not think we should complicate what we have before us. The representative of Bulgaria has pointed out that the Commission adopted by consensus the Chairman's report on agenda item 8. Indeed, the Commission did that. There was no vote. The only thing voted on in the Commission was a procedural matter about the report. Therefore, if we cannot insert "8" between "7" and "9", perhaps we can include a statement to the effect that the Commission also adopted by consensus the Chairman's report on agenda item 8 - which is a factual statement.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the question now before the Commission and it is along the same line as that of the representative of Bulgaria. It can be inserted at the end of paragraph 31. Let me add that it is not a form of repetition, because in many other instances we try to make the connection that if it appears in the introduction it should be in the conclusion, and so on. We can find a formulation or request the Bulgarian representative to read out the one he had before and see about including it in paragraph 31. I do not have a formulation.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): Section IV deals with conclusions and recommendations and states factually that we adopted by consensus the reports and the recommendations contained therein. I take it that that implies that in a report where there is no recommendation there is nothing to adopt, but the report itself was adopted.

I should like to make a formal proposal: that we add the numeral "8" after "7".

Mr. GERNAY (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The English version of the text says "the reports of its subsidiary bodies". My question is whether there was a subsidiary body.

The CHAIRMAN: It was not a subsidiary body.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): I have already made that point but it has been raised again by the representative of Belgium, namely, that the Chairman's consultations on agenda item 8 were not those of a subsidiary body of the Commission. Therefore the inclusion of agenda item 8, as suggested by the representative of Australia, would not be appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN: We would then include a separate sentence in paragraph 31 referring to the fact that this did take place, and then the report would be as factual as it could possibly be. Is that acceptable?

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): As was pointed out by the representative of Australia, this section deals with conclusions and recommendations. With all respect, Mr. Chairman, your report on agenda item 8 does not contain any conclusions or recommendations. Its adoption, as you yourself pointed out, is referred to in paragraph 17, but this Commission has not concluded or recommended anything on agenda item 8. So inclusion of any reference to the adoption of your reports in this particular section would not, in the view of my delegation, be appropriate.

Mr. TOMASZEWSKI (Poland): Could I suggest, in order to get out of this difficulty, that, in paragraph 31, after the numerals 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, we put a comma, then add the numeral 11 and then add the words "and in the Chairman's report on agenda item 8" and continue "and agreed to submit..." et cetera.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to make a proposal. Let us go back to paragraph 17.

If we look at that paragraph, at whatever meeting it was on whichever day, "the Disarmament Commission considered and adopted the reports of Working Groups I, II, III, IV, V, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI" and so on and "the Chairman of the Commission on agenda item 8" and so on. That is another suggestion. It should take care of what we are trying to deal with here.

Mr. DIMITROV (Bulgaria): I am afraid that reference to paragraph 17 is a little irrelevant because, if we refer to that paragraph, we will have to do away with all of paragraph 31. What applies to agenda item 8 applies as well to the other agenda items, and if we repeat them in paragraph 17 then why should we repeat them in paragraph 31?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, but nobody wants to accept the inclusion of the words in paragraph 31. I am only trying to see if we can come to some understanding and have the items of naval armaments and disarmament included in this report as a subject worthy of consideration and I point out again that we need to consider whether we are merely trying to include something in a report without doing anything about it. We had the same situation yesterday when we were dealing with another matter.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): May I point out that in paragraph 38 of the conclusions and recommendations in last year's report there was no reference to this particular item. As you, yourself indicated at the very beginning of our session and again in your report, Mr. Chairman, you decided to follow last year's course of action on this agenda item, and I think we should be consistent in all aspects of this course of action.

Mr. DIMITROV (Bulgaria): May I recall the words used earlier today by the representative of the United States, that we should not repeat mistakes made in the past again this year.

The CHAIRMAN: Having said that, and in accordance with the principles we have laid down, I should like to include the words "and adopted" in paragraph 17 and submit that for approval. We are not going to move if we disagree on this particular matter. If it was not reflected at all I would be concerned, but it is reflected, and I feel that we should be able to live with that given the degree of success we have had on naval armaments and disarmament. Rather than exacerbate the situation could I appeal to the representative of Bulgaria to agree that we add the words "and adopted", which would take into consideration what has taken place, in paragraph 17?

Mr. DIMITROV (Bulgaria): That is acceptable to us.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn finally to page 8, "Notes". Are there any comments? If I hear no objections, I shall take it that they are adopted.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.