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The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

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

The CHAIRMAN: Having adopted all of the individual paragraphs of the draft report this morning, we shall now take up the draft report of the Commission as a whole. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt its draft annual report, document A/CN.10/1988/CRP.11, as a whole.

The draft report, as a whole, was adopted.

CONCLUDING STATEMENTS

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon we shall hear concluding statements by delegations which have asked to speak.

Mr. TEJA (India): Mr. Chairman, three weeks ago my delegation expressed its satisfaction at seeing you preside over our work during this crucial session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission: crucial because it is taking place on the eve of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Today, as we come to the conclusion of our deliberations, my delegation would like to compliment you on the effective and skilful manner in which you have guided our work. Let me also take this opportunity to convey our appreciation to the officers of the Commission, as well as to the chairmen of the working groups and consultation groups.

This year, despite the relatively shorter duration of the session, we had a heavier agenda. Despite the strains that this imposed on the Secretariat and on the delegations, especially the smaller ones, it has been a productive session. On a number of items the Disarmament Commission has been able to conclude its deliberations successfully. On other items on which we have not been so successful we hope that, with the fresh impetus to be provided to multilateral disarmament by the third special session devoted to disarmament, it should be possible to register substantial progress next year.
(Mr. Teja, India)

On item 5, "Reduction of military budgets", the question of the outstanding paragraph 7 has been resolved, although perhaps not fully. Nevertheless, it does mark a major step forward. The implementation of the other provisions will undoubtedly enable States to bridge the gap in practice, a gap that could not be bridged at the negotiating table.

On agenda item 11, on confidence-building measures, it speaks well for the Stockholm spirit that the question of the three paragraphs that were outstanding was resolved, thus enabling the Commission to submit to the General Assembly at its special session a clean text free of brackets.

The conclusion of the work on agenda item 10, "Verification in all its aspects", in its present format is a source of particular satisfaction to my delegation. However, much more remains to be done, especially with regard to the provisions and techniques of verification and the role of the United Nations in the field of verification. While it is difficult to forecast how future work in those areas would be organized, there is a growing acceptance of the importance of the subject, which is an encouraging sign.

My delegation cannot but express its concern at the lack of progress on agenda item 4. The halting of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament are the most important tasks facing us, yet we were not able to resolve any of the paragraphs relating to that subject. The reference to the final elaboration of a comprehensive chemical-weapons convention at the earliest possible date is a timely one.

Another area in which progress has fallen short of expectations is that of conventional disarmament. In the new technological developments of directed-energy weapons and dual-purpose systems with insertable nuclear components it is possible to discern the beginnings of a new arms race. This is bound to have a negative
impact on international security. It is further evidence of the increasing proportion of the world's human, financial and technological resources that are being devoted to the arms race. In view of those developments we do hope that at our next session we can address those issues squarely within the framework of the priorities established in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament.

At the beginning of our session I addressed at length the significant threat to regional and international peace and security posed by the racist régime of South Africa. During this session limited progress has been achieved, but the slow rate of progress does not reflect the urgency that we attribute to the subject. The United Nations report provides adequate evidence, which cannot be ignored by the Commission. Since it was issued, more evidence has accumulated, clearly indicating the direction of our work.

Regarding agenda item 7, "Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament", we have attempted some preliminary work that will certainly assist in tackling this issue during the forthcoming weeks of the special session.

Similarly, with respect to agenda item 8, "Naval armaments and disarmament", it should prove possible to enlarge the consensus based on the delicate balance achieved at this session.

In conclusion, I can only add that these positive results reflect the new openings in the field of multilateral disarmament. It is a heartening sign that augurs well for the third special session. My delegation believes that at that session the General Assembly will find in our report a useful contribution to its deliberations.
Mr. FISCHER (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. Chairman, it is my delegation’s privilege to thank you in the name of the 12 member States of the European Community for the leadership you have given this year’s United Nations Disarmament Commission, for the involved and inspiring role you have taken, and for the patience and courtesy you have extended to all delegations.

My delegation would also like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Bureau, the Rapporteur, and the Chairmen of the various groups, namely Mr. Martynov of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mr. Melescanu of Romania, Ambassador Perera of Sri Lanka, Ambassador Engo of Cameroon, Ambassador Ekeus of Sweden, Ambassador Mellbin of Denmark and Ambassador Roche of Canada for their contributions. Also, I should not forget all the hard work done by the Secretariat and the Interpretation Service.

This year’s Disarmament Commission was seen by many as a forerunner of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Although we are glad that it proved possible to report out on some of the items on our agenda, our work has not been so productive a contribution to the special session as might have been wished. But if nothing else, the discussion on the latter certainly helped to clear minds and to find out where we all stand.

Let me go through the different agenda items in rapid review.

The Contact Group on item 4, on nuclear and conventional disarmament, has achieved just a few changes in last year’s text. Despite the untiring efforts of those who took part in that Group to broaden the basis of consensus, no progress could be realized. The Twelve are disappointed that further examination of the subject has passed without real results. The discussion made it clear again that fundamental divergencies between the various positions cannot be readily harmonized. The Twelve recognize the value of regular exchanges of view on the various aspects of this item. For their part, they would have welcomed wider participation in the discussion by different groups. They had hoped that the
progress in the field of nuclear disarmament and the prospects for conventional-disarmament negotiations in Europe would have a positive impact on the possibility of drafting at least a limited set of recommendations for the special session on disarmament. The Twelve hope that the special session will prove able to indicate new approaches for the future treatment of this subject.

On item 5, "Reduction of military budgets", certain progress has been made in finding language on openness and transparency in military matters as well as on the standardized United Nations reporting instrument. Even in the absence of a final agreement on principles, a promising basis for a solution has been created. We are sorry that the reporting system accepted by the General Assembly in 1980 has not yet met with the approval of all participants as a prerequisite for the beginning of negotiations. The Twelve still hope that all States will as soon as possible participate in the reporting system.

Consultations on item 6, on South Africa's nuclear capability, proceeded in a very co-operative and constructive atmosphere. Although the main point at issue could not yet be resolved, some progress was achieved as a result of intensive efforts. We continue to hope for final agreement in the future.

Concerning item 7, on the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, the Twelve note that once again the group could not agree on findings and recommendations. This is particularly regrettable since the third special session devoted to disarmament will take up the matter. What gives the Twelve hope, however, is that progress has been achieved on certain points dealing with the functioning of the United Nations disarmament machinery. We therefore appeal to all States participating in the special session to take up where the United Nations Disarmament Commission left off on this subject. We especially ask those States that intend to bring forward new proposals to examine them from the point of view of reaching consensus with other groups.
As far as item 8, "Naval armaments and disarmament", is concerned, the Twelve fully support the efforts to consolidate and broaden consensus on the question of naval armaments. The Twelve agree with the view, expressed in the United Nations study on this subject, that there is no such thing as an independent naval balance or parity and that disarmament measures in the maritime field consequently cannot be considered in isolation from the global efforts for nuclear and conventional disarmament. They welcome the fact that the existing consensus in the Consultation Group on this matter could be maintained.

As to agenda item 9, on conventional disarmament, we regret that the Working Group has only been able to agree upon a purely procedural report on its work. On this very important subject, which will be a major item at the third special session devoted to disarmament, it was once again impossible to achieve agreement on substantial recommendations. While last year the Working Group on agenda item 9 made considerable progress towards agreeing on substantive elements, this year's effort did not lead to any improvement in the situation. In the view of the Twelve the basis for consensus has even been eroded during this year's discussions. The basic conference room paper does not so far constitute a balanced and adequate comprehensive solution. As a result, the United Nations Disarmament Commission will have to come back to this subject next year. Much work remains to be done to reach agreement on basic elements. In the opening statement my delegation made on behalf of the Twelve on 2 May, we reiterated the particular interest we attach to the subject of conventional disarmament. It is conventional weapons that have been the cause of many millions of lost lives and grave suffering in different parts of the world since the end of the Second World War, and it is the expenditure on conventional armaments and forces that absorbs the overwhelming proportion of all the military budgets in the world. The process of conventional disarmament is
therefore essential for all the States of the world and should be pursued on the
global as well as the regional level.

The Twelve are pleased that it proved possible to complete our work on
item 10, on verification, as a result of constructive and co-operate efforts on the
part of all concerned. The Twelve have always accorded the highest priority to
adequate and effective verification of arms limitation and disarmament agreements.
It is our hope that the principles agreed upon will be most useful for future
negotiations in the field of arms control and disarmament. The Twelve trust that
the forthcoming special session will be able to devote time to a thorough
consideration of the recommendations of the Disarmament Commission on this subject.

As to agenda item 11, on confidence-building measures, we are grateful that it
was possible finally to reach an agreement which adequately reflects the importance
of this subject. We appreciate the constructiveness which has led those involved
in the discussion to reconcile initially differing positions in the interest of a
generally acceptable outcome. The special session now has the opportunity to
integrate these guidelines developed by the United Nations Disarmament Commission
into a broader multilateral approach to arms control and disarmament within the
United Nations system. This successful completion of a task transferred to this
body under General Assembly resolution 37/100 D of 1982 is to no small extent the
result of the experienced and skilful guidance that you, Mr. Chairman, have
provided us with in the relevant Contact Group.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the Twelve are confident that, particularly in
view of the progress made under your chairmanship and that of your predecessors
since 1982, at its third special session the General Assembly will assess
positively the work of this useful deliberative organ of the United Nations system
in the field of disarmament.
Mr. ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia): As I already noted in my statement during the general debate, the current session of the Disarmament Commission has a specific standing and differs from the previous sessions in its significance because of its close link to the third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. And this is so not only with regard to its timing but primarily to the substance of the matter. I also mentioned the positive influence of the promisingly developing international relations, including especially those between the two major Powers.

Hence, how are we to evaluate the results achieved and the whole course of this session - evaluate, apparently, with regard primarily to what it means for the follow-up work to be done at the third special session? With respect to the priorities of disarmament, it is not possible to express satisfaction with the results obtained. This fact is confirmed both by the state of deliberations on item 4 of our agenda - the discussion of questions of nuclear disarmament - and by the stagnation in the consideration of the subject of disarmament in the conventional sphere. It is also regrettable that the report on the substantive consideration of the issue of naval armament and disarmament again will not be included in the report of the Disarmament Commission.

At the same time, however, it has been possible successfully to complete the discussion of two questions which are closely related to present world developments, namely, the issue of verification in all aspects and that of confidence-building measures. The Czechoslovak delegation appreciates these two results also as a confirmation of the significance of the work of the Disarmament Commission, which is in conformity also with the standpoints expressed in the conclusions of the Prague session of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Warsaw Treaty member States held last year.
(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

In fact, the valuable outcome in the question of verification has been achieved within an extraordinarily short time, that is, at two successive sessions of the Disarmament Commission. In this context, I should like to point to a basic fact that has enabled the achievement of the agreed text. Without adequate reflection of the positions of all groups of States, we would apparently still be engaged in this matter for years to come. In the opinion of my delegation, it is also a basic prerequisite for the achievement of results in other main questions of disarmament, especially in the nuclear sphere. Moreover, this experience, like a similar one concerning the consideration of the question of confidence-building measures on the eve of the third special session, provides a guideline for the course to be taken at the coming special session. Only political will, mutual respect for each other's positions and co-operation among all groups of States will ensure a successful course of that session and the adoption of a meaningful final document.

On the other hand, the failure of the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission on the fundamental questions of disarmament is an early warning which must be analysed and, on the basis of such analysis, an approach must be chosen for the consideration of these questions at the third special session. Everything possible must be undertaken for this top event of multilateral disarmament efforts to meet the expectations of the world public and, I am convinced, also of all of us, precisely at the present stage of positive development of international relations.

I should also like to refer to one more experience which we have gathered from this session of the Disarmament Commission. It is the invariable topicality and validity of the final document of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament which, in some respects, has helped us overcome the complicated
moments in our negotiations. Without the existence of that final document, we
would obviously not have been able to achieve concrete results in such a short
time, for instance, on the verification issue. This is all the more true that a
real process of multilateral disarmament measures has not yet been set afloat. It
is obvious that a primary solution of, so to speak, associated measures cannot
solve all problems of real disarmament but can, by all accounts, generate real
prerequisites and a suitable atmosphere for the process to become a reality. It
has become apparent that mutual relationship, interconnection and also the parallel
existence of various aspects of disarmament in the final document offer an
opportunity for their gradual solution.

Consequently, what we need most at the present time is progress in the field
of disarmament on a multilateral scale, namely, on the essential questions –
progress that can be put into practice in both global and regional frameworks,
since disarmament and enhancement of security in one region fosters world peace and
provides an opportunity and an example for the solution of similar questions in
other regions.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank you for your contribution to the work of
the Disarmament Commission and also to express our appreciation for your
contribution to the adoption of one of the concrete results of this session. I
should like to express my conviction that the experience of the effective guidance
of the work done by the Disarmament Commission this year will be reflected in the
organizational arrangement of the remaining issues of the third special session.

Since it has been possible to achieve some positive specific conclusions at
this forum, our efforts to arrive at a successful outcome of the third special
session of the General Assembly on disarmament should be all the stronger.
I should also like to thank all the other Bureau members and the Chairmen of all subsidiary bodies, as well as the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Akashi, the Commission's Secretary, Mr. Lin, and all other members of the respective Departments of the United Nations Secretariat.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I am very much afraid that I am going to embarrass you in this statement because I want to say at the outset that it is the view of the Canadian delegation that the significant accomplishments that the United Nations Disarmament Commission has made this year were due in very large measure to the wisdom and authority that you exercised at all times throughout our process. I know that it is normal, one might say customary, to thank the Chairman at the conclusion of an exercise and to say that he did a good job, but I want to tell you that this time I really mean it. The hallmark that you brought to our work this year can, I think, be characterized by the use of the word "consultation". You demonstrated and proved that the process of consultation pays off in this business. You began very early, even before your formal election as Chairman in anticipation of the office that you would hold, a process of consultation with various groupings. As I was part of some of that consultation that you exercised, I saw from the outset how effective it was, and it was proven on the opening day of the session of the Disarmament Commission because you were able to come to a very rapid decision by the whole group as to the manner in which the subsidiary bodies would operate. In other words, you did not lose any time and, as a result of that, we were able successfully to complete as much of the programme as we did in a shortened time period.
Within a three-week period we have been able to do more than has been accomplished in previous years with more time available; this was because you employed the process of consultation.

I think the successful conclusion of work on the three items on which we are reporting to the Assembly — those relating to naval armaments and disarmament, confidence-building measures, and verification — reflects a measured gain for the international community in the field of arms control and disarmament. I would not like to go any further than that, because everyone, especially we in this room, are all too conscious of the great field of achievement that lies ahead of those who engage in arms control and disarmament discussions and negotiations.

None the less, it is significant that the three items I mentioned have been successfully concluded. Each in its own way will contribute to enlarged understanding and will, I believe, help the process to move at a more rapid rate.

I and the whole delegation of Canada are therefore very indebted to you, Sir; we feel that your work in leading this process has counted for quite a bit.

Of course, it is only to be expected that I should express some gratification at the successful conclusion of work on the verification item. It was no secret that Canada worked very hard, as it has for a number of years. The authorities in Ottawa and the experts I have with me, and I myself all feel pretty pleased that we achieved this. But I want to add that the success with this item came as a result of co-operation and support and the desire to have a consensus that were manifested throughout the whole Working Group last year and this year. It is, therefore, an achievement in which the entire Commission shares.

I do not want to make another speech on verification, but I just want to flag for the attention of members what has really happened with the consensus on verification: why it really is important. I think I can put it in one sentence:
The 16 principles of verification that have now been adopted by consensus, as outlined in part I of the report, represent a new consensus by the international community with respect to this very important subject and moreover lay a new foundation for all future activities by the United Nations in this area. I think that is something that helps us all.

What does this year's session of the Disarmament Commission portend for the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD III), which is to start very soon? I should say I learned two things from our experience here this year. First, I learned that SSOD III can be a success if it does not try to do too much, if it does not try to solve all the problems in this field. I believe that we must be both moderate and flexible in our approach to SSOD III. I think that we saw moderation and flexibility bring success in the three items the Disarmament Commission has successfully completed. In other words, a spirit of co-operation, moderation and flexibility goes a long way to achieving success. I do not think - and I do not want to be interpreted as thinking - that this will solve all the problems of arms control and disarmament, for surely there are vast differences of ideology and many other factors still in the way. But we have got to make some movement. I think SSOD III can help move us forward by employing the combination of moderation and flexibility that characterized work on certain items in the Disarmament Commission this year. I would hope that when it resumes work next year on items that will remain on the agenda, the Disarmament Commission will be able to manifest those qualities a little bit more in its approach to those items. We shall certainly give it all the support we can.

The second thing applicable to SSOD III I think we have learned from the Disarmament Commission's work this year is that we have got to be pragmatic, that we have got to work on the items on the agenda within a manageable context, within
the context of what is doable. What can we do together to stay on common ground and not go off into divergent horizons where we will remain apart? I think that by taking a pragmatic approach we can help make SSOD III a success. I would even go a little bit further and say that it is my view that without a pragmatic approach we risk failure at SSOD III.

I conclude on a note of optimism. I think we have learned some things. I have sensed in the Assembly and on the floor here a growing desire to make progress where we can. Under your leadership in 1988, Sir, the Disarmament Commission showed that certain things can be done that help the international community.

Mr. AZAMBUJA (Brazil): Let me first of all congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on the results we have achieved under your wise and inspiring leadership. Your very well known qualities as a diplomat were instrumental in getting us over some of our differences and in achieving progress in certain areas of our discussions.

Ambassador Roche of Canada just expressed eloquently my own personal feelings, and I think he reflected another consensus in this Commission: appreciation, warm and sincere, for your ability, your commitment and your professionalism.

The Brazilian delegation welcomes agreement on agenda items 8, 10 and 11.

The 1988 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission took place on the eve of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It was proof of its vitality that the Commission was able both to serve in some way as a preparatory session for that major forthcoming international gathering and to go a step further in the consideration of some of its agenda items.

Unhappily, the items that are frozen in the Conference on Disarmament and elsewhere showed no sign of movement in the session we are now concluding.

Multilateral negotiation of so-called nuclear items continues to be taboo for the
nuclear-weapon States. The royal road to general and complete disarmament under effective international control being temporarily closed, we have walked along narrow and winding side-tracks; we have been told by some that these tracks will also get us there, but we know for sure that on them it will take us longer to reach our original goals and even, in the worst case, that they will make us forget how clear the original route was.

The parallel paths are conventional disarmament, confidence-building measures, reduction of military budgets, naval disarmament and verification. Taken individually, each of these items is very relevant and deserves our careful consideration. Taken as a whole, however, they constitute a worrying symptom indicating the general malaise now afflicting multilateralism: its incapacity to give global answers to global problems - not because multilateralism is intrinsically incapable of doing so, but because the main actors have not been showing the required political will.

The fact that we keep entangling ourselves in secondary, if relevant, aspects of disarmament while the threat of nuclear holocaust and the equally frightening threat of an arms race in outer space loom over the horizon casts a saddening shadow over whatever progress we have made in each of these separate areas.
Mr. Azambuja, Brazil)

A more matter-of-fact, analytical approach would be to say, perhaps, that block by block, inch by inch, we will cover the full extent of our map. Nevertheless, a more dialectical view would demonstrate that the area of concern to be covered is expanding at least as fast, if not—owing to the speed of scientific and technological change—much faster than, our patchwork-like progress, perhaps condemning ours to be a never-ending task.

Another aspect of the intrusion on our agenda of subsidiary subjects, originated in very specific regional settings, is that at the same time they constitute a multilateralization of regional themes and a regionalization of our multilateral priorities. Principles, concepts, provisions and techniques adapted to areas that have the highest rates of military spending and concentration of armaments are given a universal cogency or application which they do not have and were not intended to have in the first place.

While acknowledging the relevance of progress in all areas that could diminish tension between military blocs and help build confidence where necessary, we still hope that at the next substantive session of this body focus, thought and progress will be concentrated on the areas of major importance for the future of mankind. Let us also hope that SSOD III will reaffirm our real set of priorities, giving a new thrust and a new impulse to multilateralism in the field of disarmament.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): I understand that in Chinese culture when two splendid things come together the event is sometimes referred to as a double blessing. In your case, Mr. Chairman, while I hope you have found it a blessing, you have had a double responsibility: you have had to guide us through the agenda of the Disarmament Commission in the normal and regular way, which at any time is difficult, but at the same time you have had to guide us through what I can only
call an act of preparation - preparation for the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to which others have referred. I hope you have found this a double blessing. Certainly, my delegation has found it a double blessing that you have been in the Chair at this critical time. You have guided us splendidly through both - the work of the regular session of the Commission and the act of preparation for the third special session. I think I know why, but if I were to go on and extol your virtues and special - shall I call them "Caribbean"? - characteristics, you would probably blush, so I shall stop there.

After thanking you for all that you have done for us, Sir, I should like now to look briefly at what we have done this session, in no way to look backwards, but to look forwards, especially given your second role during this session, which was to guide us in that act of preparation for the third special session.

My delegation would probably classify what we have done during this session into three broad areas: first, those matters on which without question we have made considerable achievements; secondly, those where there have been a few problems, but problems that we hope will be addressed again in the future; and some other areas where progress has not been absolute, but has been clear and encouraging.

Let me take the first area. On item 5, reduction of military budgets, my delegation has remained firmly committed, as have many others, to the principle of the freezing and reduction of military budgets. Therefore, like others, over the years we have actively supported efforts in the Disarmament Commission to develop agreed principles and guidelines to govern the actions of States in moving towards real reductions in military budgets.

This year we found that our task in this area was basically completed. There was one outstanding paragraph, paragraph 7, and we did not complete it. Clearly,
we regret that, but despite our inability to finalize paragraph 7 we Australians are heartened - and we list this as one of the positive achievements - by the progress which took place in moving towards a common formulation. In this context, we are very grateful for the efforts of Mr. Teodor Melescanu. We expect - and we hope that others share this view - that in the future it will be relatively simple to reach consensus on paragraph 7 and to finalize this question in the Commission next year.

The second positive item to which I referred was verification, item 10. First and foremost here I want to pay homage to the work Ambassador Roche and the delegation of Canada have done in this field. I remember very well, as many others do, that it is only two and a half years ago that this issue was first mooted and first floated, and it ran into difficulty. There was almost a touch of despair that we could not advance the subject, but Canada decided to go on. It did so, and today we have the result, seen under item 10. There can be no doubt that this result will do much to advance the possibility of real measures of arms control and disarmament, however negotiated - whether bilaterally, multilaterally or regionally. There is no doubt that what we in this Commission have done is something of which we can be truly proud. We have facilitated the process of reaching real measures of arms control and disarmament.

A third item on which particular progress was made was item 11, confidence-building measures. We welcome the Commission's finalization of the draft guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for the implementation of such measures on a global and/or regional level. This is similar to verification. As with verification, these measures do not in fact represent disarmament as such, but they are clearly essential to the process of arms limitation and disarmament. They are required for such concrete measures, and in
addition they contribute to the prevention of war and the matter to which we are
all enjoined by the Charter: the maintenance of international peace and security.
The link between that and confidence is irreducible, and we in the Commission have
this year made real progress in this field -- again something of which we can be
proud.

We have already seen examples of where such measures have been negotiated and
are being implemented. I think, for example, of the measures following the
negotiations in Stockholm. But in this context I want to say immediately, lest we
fall into the Eurocentric trap, that there are other measures which have also been
taken, in the Pacific and in Asia, in our own regional ways, taking into account,
as we must, our own particular requirements. All these examples -- whether the
South Pacific Forum, the Association of South-East Asian Nations or Stockholm --
illustrate the truth of what we have agreed under item 11 of our agenda at this
session: that confidence-building measures are both possible and constructive.
I say again that what we have done in this field in our present session is something of which we can be proud.

I now turn for a moment to items that have presented us with some difficulty. I do not want to dwell on them precisely because of the other function you, Sir, are performing in the double function you perform this year, which was to prepare us for the special session. We did have difficulty with agenda item 4, the general disarmament item, as we had done in the past. All I can say on that item is that I hope that the special session will read the Commission's report, will think hard about it and will give us guidance for the future. The issues involved are of course important. Our ability to work successfully on them has not been large, and this is an area in which we in the special session will need to look again and to seek new directions.

Another source of regrettable disappointment to my delegation was the result on conventional disarmament, agenda item 9. That is a subject to which many of us attach great importance and - I want to be very frank about it - many of us are deeply perplexed and puzzled as to why it has proven so difficult to make progress in this field. No one can doubt the facts. Conventional arms are a source of great difficulty to us all in terms of security and economy. Yet, we seem to find it hard in this multilateral body to make progress in this field. That disappoints us, especially as progress this year was so near, but in the end seemed to be so distant. So we look again to the special session to help us in this area.

Yesterday we tried to make a special reference of our conventional disarmament material to the special session, but for what I consider were purely mechanical reasons we were unable to do that. As you, know, Sir, yesterday I said that while I accepted that I would use this opportunity today to refer to it again. That is what I am doing now. My Government and my delegation would find it very hard to
accept that a special session devoted to disarmament, looking at the whole field, would not take a serious and robust approach towards the issues of conventional arms. For that reason we regret a little that we were unable to complete our work here, but we are happy that what we have done here will go in the overall report of the Commission to the special session.

I should now like to turn to what I call the third category of items, items in which there was some progress - perhaps not enough; items that I put in a kind of middle position. The first is agenda item 6, South Africa's nuclear capability. I, like you, Sir, have toiled in this field for too many years. Everyone knows what you took on to your shoulders over the past few years with regard to this specific item. It must have been gratifying to you, as it was to me, that this year the atmosphere was better. Things looked better and we did make some progress, but we did not come to a conclusion. Again, I have to say on the record what I have said before: the position of my Government is that apartheid is abhorrent enough; it should never be armed with nuclear weapons. I hear no one in this room saying that they disagree with that view, yet we have not been able to come to a sensible conclusion on this item. I regret that. I suspect that the difficulty is fundamentally a definitional one, and as we look at this item in the future I hope that we can sort out that definition. There is a clear difference between the fact of South Africa's nuclear potential, which is a potential to make nuclear weapons - especially as they have unsafeguarded nuclear programmes - and their proven nuclear capability, that is a nuclear-weapons capability. I should like to think that if we can sort out that definitional difference we might in future be able to get the international community to make a clear, unequivocal statement not only about the abhorrence of the apartheid régime but also about our utter rejection of the idea that that régime should ever be armed with nuclear weapons.
In the same category of items in which progress was mixed there was the question of naval armaments and disarmament, that is, agenda item 8. I think we are all aware of the need for sensitivity in the handling of this item, because of the range of delicate and difficult questions involved. This year's contact group discussions clearly underscored that point. Although it could not be claimed that great progress was achieved in the group, the Chairman did an excellent job of maintaining a consensus text for further consideration at the third special session and at next year's session of the Disarmament Commission.

Australia believes that the Commission does have an important role to play in examining ways: first, to extend and enhance confidence-building measures; secondly, to make recommendations on the possibility of negotiating a multilateral agreement on the prevention of incidents on the high seas; and, thirdly, to investigate the need for revision of the laws of sea warfare, including the relevant Hague Convention and other instruments. That three-point list is not exhaustive and we look forward to what we hope in our forthcoming meetings will be a greater degree of co-operation and understanding on this important question of naval armaments and disarmament.

The last of the issues I would put in this mixed category is a critical one, and that is the questions we dealt with under agenda item 7, the review of the United Nations machinery. I want to make it very clear that I do not say that is critical because I or my delegation has a preference, a taste, for process or form as against substance. We do not. What we are about is seeking disarmament agreements. But we know that it is in the nature of a multilateral system that must work on the basis of consensus that there is a seamless web, an unbroken link, between what we want to achieve and the machinery at our disposal for its achievement. It has been very important that we have looked as hard as we have at
the United Nations disarmament machinery to try to identify how it works in consonance with our disarmament objectives and how perhaps it might be able to be improved in order to enhance the possibility of the achievement of those objectives.

The work we did under this item represented an advance on what we had done last year, but sadly we were unable to bring it to a complete conclusion. Happily, however, we will be able to place the product of our work in front of the third special session, at which there will be a working group devoted entirely to machinery. It is the earnest hope of my delegation that what we have done here will help the special session ensure that we will have, in future, the machinery we require to make the future's agenda, in substance, work in the way that we want it to work.

I shall conclude by thanking the Secretariat. I have already expressed myself, I hope suitably fulsomely to you, Sir, but now I must thank the Secretariat for what it has done. One of the elements mentioned in our paper under agenda item 7 is how under-resourced is the Department for Disarmament Affairs. The tasks it has are far larger than the resources it has at its disposal, and we hope that this is something that will be redressed at the special session. The Secretariat has worked under the most taxing circumstances and has performed superbly. It has made a real contribution to the success of this session of the Commission and I express to the Secretariat the deepest gratitude of my delegation for its work.
Mr. KRASULIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): Interpretation from Russian: Today, as this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission concludes its work, we should like to share some thoughts about what it has achieved and the tasks that remain to be resolved in the future.

This session of the Commission - as many delegations have quite rightly mentioned - took place at a time of intensive preparations for the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In these circumstances, the aspiration which was shared by a majority of delegations to ensure the successful holding of that forum placed a special responsibility on them in considering the questions of substance before the Commission, gave the discussions as a whole a constructive spirit, and helped to ensure the successful conclusion of the session. And although there was not the same kind of progress made in all areas - and in some areas there was none at all - the overall result for this year can be assessed as positive.

That is how we see the conclusion of the work in the Group on verification. The report it adopted contains a list of principles relating to verification by which States can be guided in preparing relevant agreements in the area of arms limitation and disarmament, and also recognizes the value of continuing study of methods, procedures and means of verification. It is important that a significant place was given in the report to the United Nations role in the field of verification. A number of specific proposals were made in this connection which, we believe, deserve further study and work.

It also proved possible to conclude work and agree in consensus on guidelines for confidence-building measures. This was a compromise document, and there is hardly a delegation that could say it was 100 per cent satisfied with the outcome. However, it can indeed serve as a point of departure for further international efforts in this area.
Another achievement of this session was the substantial progress made in considering naval armaments and disarmament, primarily in the area relating to defining approaches to possible confidence-building measures in the naval field. We hope that the provisions in the paper of the Chairman of the Consultative Group, document A/CN.10/113, particularly its paragraph 7, will promote the initiation of specific negotiations on a whole series of questions relating to curbing the arms race at sea.

As for paragraph 6, although we find it unnecessarily categorical and somewhat questionable, we feel it can also be useful if it is considered not separately from, but rather together with, paragraph 7. Of course, it is regrettable that the largest naval Power, the United States of America, did not participate in that Working Group's labour.

We should like to speak in particular about what was done during consideration of the item on the reduction of military budgets. Thanks to the flexibility demonstrated by many delegations, the preconditions were met for the successful conclusion of work on the document on guidelines for the freezing and reduction of the military expenditures of States. However, a number of delegations insisted on putting forth prior conditions for beginning negotiations on reducing military budgets, and that prevented final agreement on the document. The Soviet delegation hopes that greater openness in military activities and military expenditures and realistic and symmetrical comparison of such expenditures will become an integral part of efforts to reduce the military budgets of States to a level of reasonable sufficiency.

It turned out once again that a solution to the question of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war is a political and diplomatic imperative. As a result of discussion of those questions significant progress was made; it could of course have been greater. However, it is becoming increasingly
clear that a radical improvement in international relations and the construction of a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world will require us to overcome the stereotypes of prejudice and confrontation and ensure reliable security for one and all. We hope that forthcoming consideration of nuclear-disarmament questions at the third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament will make it possible to achieve more significant results in this area, inter alia, within the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

We feel that discussion of matters relating to the role of the United Nations in disarmament was businesslike, and that made it possible for countries to understand each other's positions better. Now, on the eve of the third special session, this is particularly important. We believe that efforts should be continued with a view to achieving consensus in this area.

We could not be satisfied with the results - or, rather, the lack of results - in the Group which considered questions of disarmament in conventional armaments. We expected more from it, because we felt that all the necessary preconditions existed for consideration and progress in this area in the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Any backsliding in this field is, we feel, impermissible.

Consideration of South Africa's nuclear potential has still not budged an inch. The inertia of the old political thinking has almost become stronger here. A number of delegations interfered with the Commission's adoption of the relevant recommendation, and in effect that encourages racist Pretoria's nuclear ambitions. We feel that an end must be put to this stalemate, and the sooner the better.

That is our overall assessment of the results of the consideration of the various agenda items at this session.
In conclusion, we should like to express our sincere thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, for your most able guidance of the Commission's work; for your professionalism and mastery in overcoming the difficulties that arose as we moved towards the successful conclusion of our work; and, lastly, for your sense of humour which certainly made the session easier.

We should also like to thank those who headed the subsidiary bodies: Sergei Martynov of the Byelorussian SSR, Teodor Melescanu of Romania, Daya Perera and Edmond Jayasinghe of Sri Lanka, Paul Enco of Cameroon, Richard Butler of Australia, Rolf Ekéus of Sweden, Gustav Mellbin of Denmark, Douglas Roche of Canada, and Paul Stulpnagel of the Federal Republic of Germany. We thank all of them for their diplomatic ability, their tolerance and, above all, their sense of compromise.

Lastly, we should like to express our great thanks to Mr. Akashi and all those who assist him in the Department for Disarmament Affairs. We also thank those in other departments of the Secretariat for their contributions to ensuring the successful conduct of this session.

Mr. YAMADA (Japan): As we come close to the end of this session of the Disarmament Commission, I wish to pay tribute to you, Mr. Chairman, for the dedication and exemplary diplomatic skill with which you have brought the deliberations to a successful conclusion. I say "successful conclusion", because I believe that at this session the Commission has at least in some areas achieved what it set out to do, namely, to conduct constructive deliberations on some selected items on the disarmament agenda and report on them, so that its recommendations can effectively be used in various specific negotiations - bilateral, regional or multilateral.
At the outset of the current session, I listed three items on which my delegation hoped to attain consensus. Those were confidence-building measures, reduction of military budgets, and verification. I am glad to see that we were successful in two of them.

The report of Working Group IV on agenda item 10 demonstrates our common recognition that verification plays an essential role in any arms control and disarmament agreements and establishes some 16 principles which can serve as useful guidelines for ongoing and future negotiations.

I wish to express the very sincere appreciation of my delegation to Ambassador Douglas Roche of Canada for the tireless and dedicated manner in which he has brought this about.

The report on agenda item 11 concerning the guidelines for confidence-building measures is also the fruit of constructive compromises by delegations on which we can profitably draw in future arms control and disarmament endeavours. Allow me to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, for having successfully provided the leadership and inspiration required to build on the considerable groundwork that had been laid on the subject in the past. I should like also to express the satisfaction of my delegation that we arrived at consensus among the participating members on the question of naval armaments and disarmament under the able leadership of Ambassador Rolf Ekeus of Sweden.

I believe that the spirit of constructive compromise shown with respect to the items to which I have just referred, as well as the focus that has emerged in those areas on which no consensus was yet possible, should guide us well in our deliberations in the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. My delegation, for one, feels that the issue of conventional
disarmament deserves to be given serious and concentrated attention in the special session.

In conclusion I wish to reiterate my earnest hope that the report of the Disarmament Commission which we have just adopted will contribute to realistic and constructive deliberations in the special session.

Mr. PAN Guoxiang (China) (interpretation from Chinese): First of all, Mr. Chairman, in the name of the Chinese delegation I should like to thank you for the tremendous amount of work you have done in presiding over the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission during this session. Your rich diplomatic experience, wisdom and abilities have played an outstanding role in contributing to the success of the present session.

Taking place in the wake of the signing of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty and on the eve of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, this session was expected by many delegations to achieve concrete results, thus contributing to the success of the special session. In a sense this session is continuing the preparatory work for the special session. Many delegations have considered the agenda items in a serious, business-like and positive manner and striven to conclude work on some of them.

The atmosphere in some working groups has indeed been co-operative and constructive. We have reached consensus on guidelines for confidence-building measures. On the question of verification the Commission has continued to make headway. At its present session it has completed a preliminary consideration of this item and formulated 16 principles related to verification. Other items, such as naval armaments and disarmament and the nuclear capability of South Africa, have known varying degrees of progress.

There are of course items which, due to fundamental differences, have been denied substantive progress of any significance. On the whole the concrete results
of the current session have fallen quite a distance short of original expectations for progress. Nevertheless, we have in the course of our deliberations gained a deeper understanding of positions and views and a better insight into the complex factors involved in the items. These no doubt will prove useful in the further exploration of issues and in the search for solutions.

Curbing the arms race and striving for the realization of arms limitation and disarmament are essential for international peace and security. Those aims conform to the wishes and aspirations of all mankind and require the concerted efforts of the international community. To this end, the United Nations should and can play an important role. Any negation, detraction from or weakening of the role of the United Nations as an international, multilateral organization will compromise the arms limitation and disarmament effort and be detrimental to international peace and security.

The third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will be convened in 10 days. I earnestly hope that all parties, in particular those major Powers with primary responsibility for disarmament, will in the larger interest of international peace and security and in line with the common wishes and aspirations of the people of the world work actively and earnestly to contribute to the success of the special session. Here I should like to refer to a Chinese saying mentioned by the representative of Australia, namely, "double blessings". I hope that double blessings can become multiple blessings. China for its part will make tireless efforts to this end.

Before concluding my statement, I should like to join with other colleagues in expressing our appreciation and gratitude to the other officers of the Commission; to the chairmen of the various working groups, consultation groups and contact groups; and to Under-Secretary-General Mr. Yasushi Akashi and the Secretary of the
Commission, Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung, as well as to the other secretaries of the subsidiary bodies for their work. I should also like to thank the interpreters, translators and other staff members of the Secretariat for their services.

Mr. NOWORYTA (Poland): Our session is coming to an end and this gives my delegation an opportunity for some reflections concerning the work that has been done during these past three weeks.

There is no doubt that our deliberations have taken place against the background of an improved international situation, giving us hope for a better tomorrow. On the other hand, we have been meeting immediately before the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and our work has been dominated by a willingness to be as constructive, flexible and pragmatic as possible.
In some areas progress has been quite visible. Let me just mention the completion of two important items: the guidelines for confidence-building measures and verification in all its aspects. In other fields progress has been less visible, although the areas of agreement have broadened. On some items, regrettably, there has been no progress whatsoever. Still, taken as a whole, the results of this year's session of the Disarmament Commission will certainly be useful for the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

My delegation is particularly pleased by the positive result of this session and especially by the successful conclusion of the item concerning the guidelines for confidence-building measures. The delegation of Poland has been actively involved in the preparation of the final version of those guidelines. Even before this session of the Disarmament Commission, our delegation, together with the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany, worked out in Geneva an agreed formulation for the remaining paragraphs, and although it was not possible to adopt this proposal, we persevered in a constructive spirit and took a realistic approach to the working out of a compromise text, a substantial part of which was due to our earlier common efforts. As a result of intensive consultations conducted by Ambassador Hepburn, Chairman of the Disarmament Commission, a balanced text has been agreed, representing equally the political and the military aspects of the confidence-building measures.

My delegation sincerely hopes that progress will also be achieved in the field of nuclear disarmament, particularly after the successful conclusion of the Soviet-American intermediate-range nuclear forces Treaty and the prospect of a 50 per cent reduction in strategic nuclear armaments, as well as in the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, especially in Europe. Let me here
emphasize once again that Poland put forward a plan for decreasing armaments and increasing confidence in central Europe, known as the Jaruzelski Plan. Foreseeing the need for a gradual elimination of operational and tactical nuclear arms, the Plan, besides other important elements, stresses also the significance of eliminating the most destructive and offensive conventional arms, thus eliminating the possibility of surprise attack. The interest of Poland in regional disarmament arises from the very difficult historical experience of my country. The Jaruzelski Plan is open in character and flexible in form, allowing the opinions of other nations and Governments to be taken into consideration. We are continuing efforts to work on the Plan further and will give the Commission further specific information on our progress in due time.

Mr. Chairman, before concluding, I should like to congratulate you on the excellent job that you have done. Your experience and deep knowledge of the subject, and also your patience and effectiveness in finding compromises acceptable to all, have helped much in the success of this session. My thanks go also to the other officers of the Commission and to the very dedicated staff of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, under the effective leadership of Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Akashi.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): In the verbatim record of the 125th meeting of the Disarmament Commission held last Tuesday morning, we read, inter alia, the following statements made by you, Sir, as Chairman of the Commission:

"I would not want to make the decision to put aside verbatim records. I think that if we are to deal with it, we should do so now and settle it once and for all."
(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

"It seems to me that there is only one way of doing that, and that is to put the whole question to a vote. We can follow the rules of procedure, and I can ask two persons to speak in favour, and two against, and then put the question to a vote." (A/CN.10/PV.125, p. 8)

Then you went on to say a little later:

"The representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom have recommended that we dispense with verbatim records; the representatives of Mexico and Yugoslavia have spoken in favour of their retention." (ibid., p. 12)

After the vote which had thus been held, the Chairman announced the results as follows:

"The result of the voting is as follows: 43 delegations voted to retain verbatim records; 5 delegations voted to dispense with verbatim records.

"Therefore, based on the vote taken, the Disarmament Commission will have verbatim records at this session. It is so decided." (ibid.)

My reference to the records emphasizes the correctness of the basic provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament contained in paragraph 118 (b), which set forth the basic norms for the functioning of the Disarmament Commission as follows:

"The Disarmament Commission shall function under the rules of procedure relating to the committees of the General Assembly" - I think this is worth repeating:

"The Disarmament Commission shall function under the rules of procedure relating to the committees of the General Assembly with such modifications as the Commission may deem necessary and shall make every effort to ensure that, in so far as possible, decisions on substantive issues be adopted by consensus;" (resolution S-10/2, para. 118 (b))
The events which occurred in this instance clearly demonstrate — and it so happened that it was under your sound leadership that this occurred for the first time, Sir — the wisdom of the provisions to which I have referred. Having taken part in the genesis of the Final Document to which I referred, I can assure the Commission that, as those who were present at the 1978 meeting know, the provisions of paragraph 118, which I have just quoted, are designed to make sure that no rash action will be taken and that an effort will always be made to reach agreement. But this does not mean, nor could it mean, abandonment of the categorical provisions of rules 124 and 125 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which provide respectively that:

"Each member of the committee shall have one vote." (rule 124)

and that

"Decisions of Committees shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting." (rule 125)

The small number of delegations which seem to want to carry over from the Security Council to the Disarmament Commission the practice of the veto must realize that the Commission is an organ that is essentially different from the Council. Clearly, no attempt will be made to have a kind of dictatorship of the majority prevail; but nor can there be any question of what would be even worse, a dictatorship of the minority. The wise provisions of the Final Document must be applied faithfully. "Every effort" will always be made in order to achieve, "in so far as possible, consensus among participants." But this must be a reasonable effort and one which will not have the effect of paralysing the Commission. The way the Commission has proceeded this year, under your wise leadership, Sir, shows that this is not only feasible but that it should serve as an example for the future.
CONCLUDING STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: We began the 1988 United Nations Disarmament Commission session in a business-like and convivial manner, and thanks to that same spirit we have now concluded our deliberations on the several items on the agenda and have made appropriate recommendations to the Assembly. If we look at the accomplishments in the light of past experiences, we have just reasons to be proud. However, I warn against the urge to strut like peacocks or pat ourselves on the back. We should have done better under the circumstances.

Needless to say, it is an extremely emotional moment for me to present the traditional Chairman's concluding remarks. As difficult as this expression may be for you to grasp, let me say simply that despite the elation I felt about the birth, I am now having post-partum depression. In the early hours of the morning, as I sat alone with my thoughts, memories came flooding back and filled me with a sense of ambivalence. As I said to some colleagues the other night, the whole episode seemed to be one of waiting for election returns.

As co-ordinator of the campaign, I wanted all teams to be victorious. The fact that this did not happen, left a bitter-sweet sensation in my soul. Melodramatic? Selfish? Perhaps. Nevertheless, I reflected on the hours spent in informal discussions, the debate in committee rooms hammering out language that could be acceptable to all and displaying diplomatic traits of the "me-syndrome" against the "our responsibility" concept, which prevailed almost until the very last moments of our scheduled session. I also pondered on the determination of my colleagues to pursue every avenue that might lead to success.

I contemplated on another form of selflessness which must not go unmentioned: the willingness of delegations to work in smaller conference rooms without the use of interpreters. As I drifted from committee room to committee room, I observed several kinds of approaches, but the one that remained constant was evidence of the
willingness of delegations to try once more to resolve difficulties on a paragraph, a phrase or a word.

The most dynamic impression came from reflecting on a comment that several individuals said to me: that is, "We are praying for you". The sentiment needs no further clarification.

At first I thought it would be interesting to comment briefly on all of the working, consultation, and contact groups. But I discarded the idea as superfluous since you have heard the reports which adequately reflect the tenor and outcome of the exercises.

Permit me, instead, to divide my comments into three categories:

First, the 1988 United Nations Disarmament Commission session, held at a very auspicious moment, was rightly termed by many as a forerunner in formalizing the agenda for the third special session devoted to disarmament. The session, in some respects, has lived up to that expectation and failed in others. Nevertheless, we can be hopeful that the success achieved would serve as a catalyst to spur further positive action, particularly on the resolution of procedural matters in the remaining days before the session opens.

Secondly, the sheer numbers of the groups militated against in-depth participation on the part of most, if not all, delegations. The weight of the political atmosphere pervading the several items caused consternation on the part of some, ambivalence and cynicism on the part of others. Yet there was always that nucleus that believed that a successful outcome could be achieved. I must point out, however, that even though those who felt that success had to be on their term, left the door open for compromise, thereby promoting co-operation, and interdependence prevailed in the end.
(The Chairman)

Thirdly, it now remains for me to express my appreciation for the support which all delegations have demonstrated throughout my tenure as Chairman. I must admit that it was not easy for me to accept the praise you heaped on me through the generous comments made. The luncheons you gave were easier, because I was convinced that they were given for yourselves as much as for me, since the culture dictates that *homo sapiens* should have at least one meal per day.

Now this is my chance to say most sincerely that I could not have done any of this without your support. I saw us as a team: the Bureau, the Chairmen and Co-ordinators of the subsidiary bodies, the consultation groups. You were my ear, you were my sounding-board, you were my accomplices.

While I do not wish to name each representative since each in his own way contributed to effecting the seriousness I wished to attribute to our efforts, I must make reference to and commend for their untiring efforts Ambassador Douglas Roche, Paul Engo, Edmond Jayasinghe, Daya Perera and Skjold Mellbin for the manner in which they conducted work in their various working groups; and Mr. Teodor Melescanu in Consultation Group on reduction of military budgets, Mr. Sergei Martynov as Co-ordinator of item 4, and Ambassadors Rolf Ekeus and Richard Butler for co-ordinating the work in naval armaments and disarmament and the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, respectively.

With respect to the success on item 8, it was due first and foremost to the skilful manner in which Ambassador Ekeus carried out the onerous task of co-ordinating on behalf of the Chair. Ambassador Douglas Roche knows my sentiments regarding the invaluable service he has rendered to the success of our deliberations. He and his country should be justly proud of the accomplishments.

Then there were the behind-the-scenes supporters who tirelessly and quietly pushed to make the pieces fall in place. Without them the puzzle would have remained unsolved.
(The Chairman)

The Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Yasushi Akashi, and his entire staff have ably rendered every assistance any Chairman could want. I cannot fail to express appreciation to the Commission Secretary, Mr. Kuo-chung Lin and his secretary, Miss Anita Ng, for their invaluable contribution. I am not certain how Mr. Lin reacted inwardly at such times, but I congratulate him for his patience in acquiescing to my demands in such an efficient and co-operative manner. I support views expressed that consideration be given to supplementing the staff of the Department for Disarmament Affairs. Last but not least, the interpreters, editors, press writers and conference service officers are to be commended for their devotion to duty. In my estimation they are the unsung heroes in this game.

Dear colleagues, I know that this all sounds like someone who has just received a Tony award, but please bear with me as I express one final vote of thanks to the participants of the Consultation Group on item 11. I referred to them as a "fun group". They were with me at every turn. I cajoled and they rallied; I retreated and they pursued; I led and they followed. This applies equally to the silent as well as vocal players. If I were going to be out on a limb, I would want them for my net. This special tribute seemed in order, because it is with this Consultation Group that I had the closest contact. However, the gist of the overall gratitude covers the entire Commission.

While I would not retract one tittle of the satisfaction embodied in my concluding remarks, I cannot refrain from reiterating the refrain I mentioned earlier: We should have done better.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION


The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.