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REPORT OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS FORTIETH SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with our programme of work, we are meeting this afternoon in order to adopt formally, in plenary meeting, the reports on the various agenda items considered by the Commission during the current session.

Before I begin with those reports, let me say again that, with a view to the speedy conclusion of our work, I thought that we should make efficient use of the time available to us by beginning, this afternoon, the concluding statements which should follow the formal adoption of the report of the Commission as a whole.

There is also the question of the annexes to our report. This question, which arose in one of the smaller groups with which I was directly associated, was left for consideration and discussion in plenary meeting. Before I ask for comments from delegations, I shall call on the Secretary of the Commission.

Mr. ALEM (Secretary of the Commission): Mr. Chairman, as you have correctly pointed out, the question of the annexes was left for discussion, consideration and probably decision in plenary meeting. The Secretariat is under the obligation to point out to delegations, or to groups or bodies, the rules governing the annexation of documents to reports. The General Assembly issues an information document every year; this year that document bears the symbol A/INF/40/1. In that document, which was issued on 9 May 1985, there is a paragraph regarding annexes to the Official Records, which reads as follows:

"The General Assembly recommended by resolution 2292 (XXII), annex, paragraph (j), that the substantive departments concerned should strictly limit the number and length of the documents they select for inclusion in the annexes to those essential for the understanding of the relevant discussion. Further, as a specific point, no document which was already, or would be, printed or reproduced by the internal offset process should be included in the annexes. Equally, the inclusion of a document in an annex should exclude it from any separate printing or reproduction by internal offset later."

(A/INF/40/1, para. 49)
The CHAIRMAN: Delegations will note that the guidelines laid down in this particular resolution are somewhat flexible. I would propose, therefore, that the Commission should agree to annex to its reports those documents that Working Groups thought essential for their conclusions and also for the report of the Commission. In effect, this would mean that we follow the procedure that we followed for the Commission's 1984 report. I have spoken to a number of delegations and I have the distinct impression that delegations would like the procedure used in 1984 to be followed in 1985 also.
Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): I should like to draw attention to the regrettable fact that document A/CN.10/74 is not included. This is a letter from the delegation of the Soviet Union transmitting the text of the reply of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the National Council of the French Republican Association of War Veterans and Victims. This document and the explanation of the Soviet leader on the question of the limitation of nuclear weapons is a fundamental element in the Soviet position. The delegation of the Soviet Union frequently referred to this document in plenary meetings of the Commission and we ask that it be included in the list presented by you, Mr. Chairman, of documents to be annexed to the annual report of the Disarmament Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary.

Mr. ALLEN (Secretary of the Commission): Informal paper No. 4, which has been distributed to delegations, includes, not necessarily or exclusively, a limited number of annexes. These are the annexes that are mentioned in reports as being annexed. However, if the Commission wishes to include as annexes, other documents that are or are thought to be relevant to the reports, it will be the duty of the Secretariat to include them.

Mr. DEPASSE (Belgium): On the basis of the request just made by the representative of the Soviet Union and the reply by the Secretary, my delegation would be grateful if the working paper submitted by 13 countries, including my own (A/CN.10/1985/CW/WP.2), were also mentioned on page 11 of the draft report of the Disarmament Commission, in paragraph 25 (e).

Mr. SHARMA (India): Mr. Chairman, apropos your statement earlier that the procedure regarding annexes followed at the last session of the Disarmament Commission should in general be followed this year, I would point out that the working paper (A/CN.10/75), submitted by India and Nigeria, on the review of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade has not been included in informal paper No. 4, dated 29 May. I request that this paper also be included among the annexes.

Mr. ELBE (Federal Republic of Germany): It is a matter of principle for my delegation that there should be no duplication of documents. My delegation feels strongly about using the meagre financial means available to us as sensibly as possible. It would not hurt any delegation to decide beforehand what it intends
to do. If it chooses to have a working paper, which is probably published as a
United Nations document, the document has received appropriate attention. If,
however, it chooses to introduce a conference room paper, this should be annexed,
thus receiving equally appropriate attention. But, in the view of my delegation,
o no delegation should have its cake and eat it too. No working paper that has been
issued as such and has become an official document of the United Nations should be
included in the report; this would avoid undue duplication. If last year working
papers that had been published as official documents were added to the report, last
year's experience was clearly in contradiction of the General Assembly's desire to
avoid duplication of the publication of documents. It is the firm belief of my
delegation that such bad practice should not be repeated.

Mr. PAVLOVSKY (Czechoslovakia): I note that the joint statement made on
9 May in the plenary Commission on behalf of a group of eight delegations is not
listed among the documents to be annexed to our report.

I think that that statement, which reflects the fundamental approach of a
number of delegations to the tasks of the Disarmament Commission, should be added
to the list of documents to be annexed to the Commission's report, since that
statement reflected substantive views which are particularly relevant this year on
the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the victory over nazism and fascism and
the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations itself.

Therefore I request that this document, notwithstanding considerations of
economy, be included among the annexes to our report.
Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): We are obviously opening up a Pandora's box here, and one with financial implications. One delegation states that it wants a working paper of its own annexed to our report, and then, of course, all the other delegations follow suit and want their own papers annexed as well. The financial consequences of this are likely to be considerable, and when we have reached the end of the bidding on adding annexes I should like a statement from the Secretariat as to exactly what the financial implications would be.

What is being suggested seems to us to be against the clear intention of General Assembly resolution 2292 (XXII), to which the Secretary of our Commission referred and which is annually reissued as an information document of the General Assembly. It is clearly relevant to our work here not to go against the intention of that document.

I suggest that what is needed is consistency in approaching the question of annexes to our report. That consistency should be based, first, on the principle that you mentioned, Mr. Chairman, in your opening statement - that the document should be agreed by all members to be essentially relevant to the report; and, secondly, on the principle that documents which do not fall into that category, which have already been issued as working papers, should not be annexed to the report because they are already available, therefore it is sufficient to have a reference to the document.

I hope that perhaps we can push things back into Pandora's box and agree to treat the question of annexes in that way, with consistency and fairness.

Mr. THIELICKE (German Democratic Republic): In the framework of the discussions on item 4 in the contact group and in the Committee of the Whole my delegation introduced a working paper (A/CN.10/1985/CW/WP.1), which it would, of course, like to be included in our report.

Mr. ABOUL-NASR (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation finds it very difficult to understand the procedure that we are following at this meeting. The Commission is considering what is to be added to the report which it will submit to the General Assembly. I believe that before we take a decision on that we should reach agreement on the report itself and only then move on to the discussion of the annexes to the report. My delegation has no objection to a large number of annexes being added to the report. Frankly, however, we find the present discussion rather strange. Not very much has been accomplished by the Commission
and our report will therefore be expressing that rather bitter fact, because we were unable to reach agreement on most of the issues before us. So it must be admitted that we are discussing a rather strange issue - that is, what should be added and annexed to the report to fill a void which should have been filled through agreement on our agenda items.

We believe that we should not annex papers that have already been issued as United Nations documents, but should simply mention their symbols. The report should be confined to reflecting the discussions in the Commission and the symbols of the documents distributed should be given, so that anyone who wants to consult the documents discussed, and above all those on which no agreement has been reached, can find them easily.

I have heard some requests concerning documents distributed by delegations. If they are to included, why not include the reports submitted by members? All these documents have been considered, and now pages and pages would be added to our report to the General Assembly if they were all annexed - and who is going to be reading those annexes, anyway? The representative of the German Democratic Republic pointed out a few days ago the high cost of printing just one page - thousands of dollars, apparently. At a time when people all over the world are suffering from hunger, we believe that the United Nations potential should be used for the benefit of mankind.

The report of this Commission should be a true reflection of what took place in our discussions, and should not be burdened with the addition of documentation that has already been distributed.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I regret that the Soviet delegation should have opened a Pandora's box; I had no such intention. But the Soviet delegation will never agree to discrimination of any kind.

In the list just distributed as informal paper No. 4, point 4 refers to document A/CN.10/69 and Add.1-5. As the Commission is aware, that document is the report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations containing replies of Governments to his questions on item 7 of our agenda. If we were to follow the logic of the representative of the United Kingdom and some other delegations - and I am prepared to do so - that document would be excluded.
It was issued as an official document of the General Assembly and it was
distributed. Furthermore, in the whole history of the Disarmament Commission
never have replies to letters of the Secretary-General been annexed to reports of the
Disarmament Commission. Therefore, as you probably know, Mr. Chairman, when the
report of Working Group III was presented we made a reservation and said that we
would not object to having the documents enumerated in point 4 annexed provided
there was no discrimination.

We therefore insist that either document A/CN.10/74 be included or we shall
not join in the consensus that document A/CN.10/69 and Add.1-5 be included.

Mr. DEPASSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I think that the
proposals of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union are quite reasonable. To
avoid any ambiguity, let me say that the statement I made earlier was aimed at
ensuring that there be a mention of the document of the 13 States, not that it be
annexed.

I suspect that because of the words used by me and other representatives some
confusion has been created between a request that there be a mention and request
that the document be annexed to the report. In any case I have consulted my
colleague from the German Democratic Republic and he tells me that he was saying
exactly the same thing as I was saying: that there should be a mention of the
document and not that it should be reproduced. The Secretariat might perhaps be
asked to go over all these problems and make sure that we economize as much as
possible and that there is no discrimination in the way the various documents are
treated. I think that what we should do is mention documents introduced liberally,
widely and extensively, but reproduce them only in exceptional circumstances,
trying to save as much as we can.

The CHAIRMAN: The question asked by the representative of the United
Kingdom about the likely cost of including all the annexes that have so far been
indicated to us is a relevant one, and I shall pass it on to the Secretariat. If the
Secretariat is able to give a figure, we should be able to reach a decision on
this question.

Mr. SHARMA (India): Mr. Chairman, I feel that I must comment on your
statement that knowledge of the cost of the annexes would help us to decide what to
do in the report.
I should like to raise a point of principle. In the past several years the element of the cost of printing papers and documents has not been a consideration when dealing with the report of the Disarmament Commission. To bring that consideration in at this stage could have a very insidious effect, because it would tend to stifle the voices of those who want to say something on disarmament.

On the one hand, we have to contend with the consensus rule, which prevents a lone voice making a point from being heard. On the other hand, when the consensus rule stops us from reaching a single recommendation, there is at least the partial satisfaction that each individual State has its own opinion and views heard, and those views are also given a place in the report, so that a judicious reader can go through the report and find out what the views were.

This question of the cost of individual views will have the effect of restricting the output because, if this logic is stretched to its extreme, what will there be in the report? It will be the same jumble of words, the same jumble of sentences, repeated again and again. Just because documents bear different symbols, that does not mean that they are treated separately. If one were to scrutinize the documents enumerated in this informal paper, one would find innumerable repetitions. Are the proponents of this financial stringency saying that we should not have repetitions in the report of the Disarmament Commission? If that is what they intend, the reports should be cut down to nothing. I do not see the rationale behind this kind of exercise, which will reduce us to doing nothing but count pennies, sentences, full stops and so on.

So I beg the Commission to agree that this whole exercise, in which we tend to decide the worth and the substance of our work in terms of the financial cost, should be stopped.

Mr. Mgbokwere (Nigeria): My delegation appreciates the views expressed by various delegations on this subject, including the question of the financial consequences and the volume of paper involved. What we do not understand is the selective approach to listing the annexes, which we regard as extremely unsatisfactory. Against this background we entirely support India on this subject, and we insist that our own working paper, that submitted by India and Nigeria, also be annexed.
The CHAIRMAN: I think that the only reason for looking at the financial implications was to find out whether the Disarmament Commission could in any way respond to the guidelines which the General Assembly has given with regard to documentation. If it is the feeling of the Commission that it is unable, for perfectly good reasons, to respond to those guidelines, that will be the wish of the Commission. We have to decide whether we want to follow the procedure that has been followed in previous years, in which case all documents will be annexed to the report of the Commission, or if we want to follow another procedure in 1985 which may respond literally to the General Assembly guidelines, in which case those documents that have been issued separately for internal use during the Commission's session will only be mentioned in the report and not annexed to it. I think that this is a fair question which the Commission must answer.
Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation is ready to react positively to the appeal by the General Assembly on the question of saving financial resources. We believe there is no reason to duplicate documents that have already been distributed as documents of the United Nations and the General Assembly.

What we do object to and shall continue to object to - and I wish to stress this - is discrimination. This list could be limited to those documents which have not already been published or it could include all the documents that have been mentioned by various delegations - I would have no objection to publishing all the documents mentioned by other delegations, on the same level.

Hence, I think that we must take a decision of principle: either we respond to the appeal of the General Assembly, and in that case all the documents that have already been published will disappear from the list; or we do not respond to the appeal of the General Assembly, and in that case we shall follow the previous practice and, consequently, document A/CN.10/74 would be included in the annex.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the Soviet Union for stating clearly the question which the Commission must answer. I would emphasize, as he did, that we must be consistent. Whatever decision we take, we must not indulge in casuistry. We must not take one decision in the case of a particular item on the agenda and another decision in the case of another item. The Commission must decide whether it wishes to follow the previous practice - that is, to annex all its reports and present a self-contained document to the General Assembly; or whether it wishes from this year onwards merely to mention the documents that have already been issued for the internal use of the Commission. That is the question we must answer.

Mr. MIGLIORINI (Italy): We feel that the proposal just made by the representative of the Soviet Union is reasonable and we therefore support it.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think there is any difference of opinion on being consistent. I think that what we must decide now is whether we want to follow the practice of previous years or to institute a new practice this year, a practice based on principle and to be consistently applied - that is, that documents that have already been circulated internally during the course of the Commission's work would not be annexed to the report of the Commission itself.
Mr. ELBE (Federal Republic of Germany): I do not think that that is quite the question, Mr. Chairman. Rather, I think that the question is whether we should adhere this year to a practice that has proved to be wrong. We have been informed that the relevant services have criticized the practice adopted at last year's session. Now, what is so insidious - to use the term of my Indian colleague - about asking for compliance with a recommendation of the United Nations General Assembly and, hence, correcting a mistake made in previous years?

My delegation listened very carefully to the explanations given by the secretariat during our discussion of this very matter in connection with the debate on the naval arms race. Those explanations led my delegation to believe that it would be more advisable to adhere to the principle set forth in the recommendation by the United Nations General Assembly, a principle which would enable us to manage the few financial resources available to us in a reasonable way.

Mr. SHARMA (India): I have a question in this respect. Throughout the work of our Commission this year, we have at many stages, for the sake of expeditious action, followed the practice of past years. At many points our decisions have been taken on the basis of precedent. When we were drafting these reports now before us, we based ourselves on the practice followed for the annexes to previous reports. What was done in the past has generally guided us. We have always had at the back of our minds the thought that we should not tamper with the practice we have accepted in the past.

Now this whole question of financial implications in regard to printing has suddenly come up, and a General Assembly resolution of the twenty-second session - if I am not mistaken - has been quoted. Apparently, that resolution has been there for quite some time. So my question is: why is it only this year that we have become involved in this exercise? I ask the question particularly because at this session the Commission has become involved in endless, futile exercises on many other points - in trying to establish working groups, in trying to set the organizational framework. Throughout these three and one half weeks or so, we have been wasting time on many procedural points. Now it appears that we are getting involved in another procedural point which can take two or three days to decide but which can be easily avoided by adhering to the past practice.
Again I should like to invoke a common American saying: "don't fix it if it ain't broke". I do not think that the reports of the Disarmament Commission last year and the year before last were too bulky; other United Nations bodies, including disarmament forums, have reports that are much larger, with many more words and pages.

Hence, I would make a plea for adhering to the past practice and bringing our work to a speedy conclusion.

*Mrs. SHAND* (Australia): There is another saying: "better late than never". Quite frankly, I wish to associate my delegation with the comments made by the representative of Egypt. We are interested in the financial consequences of our actions. I propose that all documents that have already been published not be published again.
Mr. Ramaker (Netherlands): I think, Mr. Chairman, that earlier you said that we should be consistent—either with last year's practice or within our work this year—and apply the same rule to all documents, whether or not they were to be included in the report as annexes. In this connection, and in order to have a complete picture of what we are discussing here, I should be very pleased if the Secretariat could inform us what the costs will be if all documents that delegations wish to include are annexed to the report. This is basically the same question that was posed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

The Chairman: I am sure that the Secretariat will be able to answer the question that has been raised. I think that the debate we have had on this issue has been useful, but I fear it is not leading us to a consensus on the subject. I should, therefore, like to follow the advice given by the representative of Egypt. If the Commission agrees, we could perhaps proceed to consider the draft reports on the various agenda items and the draft report of the Commission and revert to the question of the annexes after the report has been adopted. The Secretariat may by that time be in a position to answer the question put by the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. Issraelyan (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Of course, we agree with the Chairman's proposal, but we should like to ask that we be given some information about the financial implications of including as annexes not only the three documents which represent a duplication but also all those the reproduction of which has been requested by the Soviet Union, by Belgium, by the German Democratic Republic, by Czechoslovakia and by other States. Everyone probably agrees that either we include all documents requested by delegations or we exclude all documents that have already been published.

The information to be provided should therefore relate not only to the three documents mentioned in points 4, 5 and 9 of informal paper No. 4 but also to the documents requested by delegations.

The Chairman: I call upon the Secretary of the Commission to reply.

Mr. Alem (Secretary of the Commission): I do not think that I can provide that information about the financial implications at the present time. To do so would entail going back to the Department of Conference Services and to the financial services and making some calculations.

However, I should like to make a few remarks about informal paper No. 4. That paper is not a list of documents that should or will be annexed to the report. It
is up to the Commission to decide which papers it wishes to annex to the report. The informal paper simply lists the documents referred to in the reports of the working groups to the Commission. When a working group mentions in its reports that, in connection with its work, it had before it replies of Member States to the Secretary-General regarding review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, and then gives a symbol, such as A/CN.10/69 and Add.1-5 or A/CN.10/71, and states that those documents are annexed to the present report, the "present report" in question is the report of a working group to the Commission, not the report of the Commission to the General Assembly. It is up to the Commission to decide what it wishes to annex to its report to the Assembly.

The second point I should like to make is that - taking precedence as a guide - the Commission has never included replies by Member States to notes verbales of the Secretary-General in its reports as annexes, since such replies form a separate report of the Secretary-General; they are not working papers. Thus, although there is nothing in the rules that says such replies should not be annexed to the report, there is a strong precedent not to annex them because they are already contained in a separate report and have not been annexed in the past.

The third point I should like to make concerns financial implications. It would probably be better if I were to go and obtain figures rather than talking here, but the fact is that many of the documents which delegations have requested should be included in the report as annexes have already been issued in all languages. The cost of translation has thus already been met. So what is required is only the reissue of, say 20, 25 or 30 pages for inclusion in the report. After I have calculated how many pages are involved, I shall ask the financial services how much it will cost to reproduce them and include them in the report.

**Mr. Sharma (India):** In the context of the Secretary's reply to the question raised by the delegation of the United Kingdom, I should like to add that when the Secretary does find out the eventual cost of reissuing a document as part of a document embodying the report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission it may also be useful to find out what the cost of reissuing a conference room paper (CRP), not a working paper, would be. In that way we shall know the relative cost of reproducing a working paper and a CRP in the document.

**The Chairman:** I think that perhaps we can defer a decision on this subject and turn to the report of the Commission itself.
REPORTS BY CHAIRMEN OF WORKING GROUPS

The CHAIRMAN: In initiating the process of the consideration and adoption of the reports on the individual items, I propose to call upon each of the Chairmen to introduce the report of his Group. I shall begin with the draft report of the Committee of the Whole on agenda item 4 (a) and (b) (A/CN.10/1985/CRP.2).

The Committee of the Whole, which was established by the Commission at its first meeting, was allocated this item under the chairmanship of the Commission. The Committee of the Whole had a general exchange of views on this item and established a contact group which, after four meetings, produced the report and the annex contained in the document I have just introduced.
May I call attention to some changes in the document. First, the text of paragraph 3 (f) is to be replaced by the following:

"Letter dated 14 May 1985 from the Head of the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission (A/CN.10/74)".

Secondly, in paragraph 6, in the fourth line from the bottom, the words "It was also suggested" are to be replaced by the words "The proposal was also made".

Finally, on page 4, in the annex "Compilation of proposals for recommendations on agenda item 4", the last four words in the third line of Recommendation No. 4 are to appear as follows: "Nuclear and space arms" - the capital letters having been removed.

Are there any comments?

**Mr. de La BAUME** (France) (interpretation from French): In the fifth line of paragraph 6 of the French version, the sentence beginning "As in 1984" says that the Contact Group was able at the current session of the Commission to reach a consensus. The opposite is true, and the translation needs to be corrected to read "the Contact Group was unable" in accordance with the English version.

**The CHAIRMAN**: The Secretariat has taken note of that error.

May I take it that it is the Commission's wish to adopt the report of the Committee of the Whole on agenda item 4 (a) and (b) (A/CN.10/1985/CRP.2), with the changes that have been pointed out, including that in the French language version?

The report was adopted.

**The CHAIRMAN**: Next is the report of Working Group I on agenda item 5, entitled "Reduction of military budgets" (A/CN.10/1985/CRP.3).

Before calling on the Chairman of the Working Group, the representative of Romania, to introduce the Group's report, I call on the Secretary of the Commission.

**Mr. ALEM** (Secretary of the Commission): The word "annex" should not appear at the end of paragraph 8. The paragraph should end as follows: "(A/CN.10/64)".

**Mr. TINCA** (Romania, Chairman of Working Group I): I thank the Secretary for making that correction, which accords with the text we adopted in the Working Group.

I have pleasure in introducing the report of Working Group I on the reduction of military budgets. The report is extensive and reflects the stage reached by the Commission in the consideration of agenda item 5.
This year the Commission had entrusted to it by the General Assembly the mandate of finalizing the principles which should govern further actions of States in the field of freezing and reduction of military budgets. The Working Group held eight meetings, during which it devoted a great deal of attention to finding an appropriate solution to the main, substantive question on which the positions of States were still divergent. The Group managed to broaden the area of agreement on many principles that were accepted on a provisional basis and subject to an agreement on the whole set of principles. In this context the Group managed to remove some of the existing brackets in the working paper that it had before it as a basis for discussion. At the same time, there were still important divergent views concerning other principles and ideas.

The report of the Working Group presents in an appropriate manner the position of various delegations on all controversial issues. Various formulas and ideas were considered, formally or informally, in order to identify a possible compromise solution. It appears that the achievement of that goal was not possible at the current session. The Working Group therefore agreed to recommend that:

"The General Assembly request the Commission to continue the consideration of the item entitled 'Reduction of military budgets' and in this context to finalize at its next substantive session the principles that should govern the actions of States in the field of freezing and reduction of military expenditures on the basis of the working paper annexed to the present report, as well as other proposals and ideas on the subject-matter;"

"The General Assembly draw anew the attention of Member States to the fact that the identification and elaboration of the principles which should govern further actions of States in freezing and reducing military budgets could contribute to harmonizing the views of States and create confidence among them conducive to achieving international agreements on the reduction of military budgets;"

"The General Assembly urge all Member States, in particular the most heavily armed States, to reinforce their readiness to co-operate in a constructive manner with a view to reaching agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain military expenditures." (A/CN.10/1983/CRP.3, para. 17)
The Working Group decided to annex to the draft report the working paper which contains the principles and reflect the stage that we have reached in the consideration of these principles, together with all the amendments and proposals presented during the debate in the Working Group. I hope that the decision of the Working Group to annex all of these papers is in conformity with the relevant resolution of the General Assembly.

Bearing in mind the fact that the draft report of the Working Group was the product of intensive and extensive consultations among the various interested delegations, I hope that the plenary meeting will adopt it by consensus.

Before concluding this introduction of the report, I should like to thank all delegations that contributed to the slight progress that we have recorded this year in considering this item and also to express my gratitude to all the delegations that participated and showed interest in the activities and debates of Working Group I.

Finally, I believe that all those who participated in the Working Group will agree with me if I express our gratitude to our Secretary, Mr. Zaleski, for the contribution that he made to the achievement of our final result.

The CHAIRMAN: May I take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report of Working Group I?

The report was adopted.


Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas, Chairman of Working Group II): I have the honour to state that the report (A/CN.10/1985/CRP.4) represents the agreement reached in Working Group II on the question of the nuclear capability of South Africa. Paragraphs 1 through 5 contain the relevant procedural information, which I outlined at a previous meeting. Paragraph 6 outlines the efforts made by delegations of the Working Group in an attempt to produce a consensus text. Paragraph 7 contains the elements of the recommendation, which it is hoped the plenary meeting will adopt.

I wish to express my appreciation to delegations for the manner in which they carried out informal consultations and for their expressions of willingness to find a solution and their flexibility. I trust that the energy shown during those
consultations and at the last meeting will be redoubled in future negotiations on
this item. I also wish to express my gratitude to the Secretariat and to the
secretary of the Working Group, Mr. Lin, for their co-operation and contribution.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it was pleasure for me to serve on the Bureau under
your guidance and I particularly commend you for your fairness and the patience
that you demonstrated in dealing with the issues. The calmness that you displayed
helped me immensely in presiding over Working Group II with a greater degree of
restraint.

The CHAIRMAN: May I take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the
report of Working Group II?

The report was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Chairman of Working Group III,
Ambassador Engo, to introduce the draft report on agenda item 7, entitled "Review
of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament"

Mr. ENGO (Cameron, Chairman of Working Group III): I should like to
begin by pointing out a typographical error in paragraph 6 of the draft report. In
the last line but one, the document number in parenthesis should read

It is a great honour and privilege for me to have this opporunity to introduce
the draft report of Working Group III, which deals with agenda item 7, on the
review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. The draft
report of the Working Group (A/CN.10/1985/CRP.5/Rev.1) was adopted by consensus at
the seventh and final meeting of the Group yesterday morning, 28 May.

It is common knowledge that the Working Group had very limited time available
to it, having been established only on 17 May. Apart from yesterday's meeting,
which was devoted to the consideration and adoption of its draft report, the work
of the Group really took place during six meetings held between 21 and 24 May. The
Commission may wish to take note of the fact that the subject is a new one and that
in beginning a new subject a great deal of energy and time must be dissipated in
trying to find the right way to proceed. Faced with that limited time, it is
really significant that the Group was able to make the progress that, I would
suggest with all humility, it did make. That was due largely to the constructive
spirit of co-operation displayed by all delegations.
I should like to take this opportunity to reiterate my deepest appreciation to all delegations in Working Group III for their very valuable co-operation. The subject matter combined complexity with compelling importance, and the Group was confronted with severe time restraints, which called for the demonstration of the highest ideals of compromise and understanding by all delegations. I deeply appreciate the fact that we were able to overcome seemingly unsurmountable difficulties in a great spirit of compromise. I might add also, Mr. Chairman, that we were able to follow the very good example that you have set for us all.

Naturally, it is important to stress our disappointment that we are not in a position to present a draft report that fully meets the request addressed to the Disarmament Commission by the General Assembly in resolution 39/151 G. We must recall with appropriate emphasis that the General Assembly, in that resolution, requested the Commission to carry out as a matter of priority a comprehensive review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and to submit to the Assembly at its fortieth session a report that should include "findings, recommendations and proposals, as appropriate."
As I pointed out earlier, for various reasons work on this issue began very late at the current session of the Commission. This certainly was an unfortunate development, especially since it meant that yet another request by the Assembly to the Commission has gone unanswered, but we are encouraged by the seeming commitment by all to a comprehensive review.

During the extensive exchange of views that took place in the course of the proceedings of the Working Group, the importance of the agenda item was fully recognized, especially as the Group was convinced that the process of disarmament affects the vital security interests of all States, and that all States must be actively concerned with and contribute to that process since disarmament measures have an essential part to play in the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security.

On the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, which was established for the primary purpose of maintaining international peace and security, it is important to stress the intimate link between disarmament and security, and the central role of the United Nations in this field.

As pointed out in our report, the Working Group reached agreement on "Topics for appropriate recommendations", which would serve as a programme of work for the consideration of this item. It ensures that in any future endeavours on this critical item unproductive repetitions of a general character will be avoided and commencement of the comprehensive review expedited. It is my hope that the procedures of the plenary will facilitate attainment of that objective. It is my hope also that the documents annexed to the report of Working Group III will be seen to assume a special character.

As pointed out in the Group's report, the programme as agreed to does not preclude the introduction of additions to it.

We would draw special attention to a proposal submitted by a delegation in the Group that the United Nations Secretariat should update the publication entitled The United Nations and Disarmament to cover the period 1945 to 1985. That proposal was not discussed, but it should be noted that no objection was raised to it in the Group.
The Group adopted, by consensus, the following recommendation on agenda item 7:

"The Disarmament Commission recommends to the General Assembly that work to be accomplished under General Assembly resolution 39/151 G of 17 December 1984 be continued by the Commission as a matter of priority at its next substantive session in 1986, with a view to the elaboration of concrete recommendations and proposals, as appropriate, regarding the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, taking into account, inter alia, the views and suggestions of Member States as well as the aforementioned documents on the subject." (A/CN.10/1985/CRP.5/Rev.1, para. 8)

It is clear that Working Group III is committed to the completion of the mandate given to the Disarmament Commission by the General Assembly on the question of the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. For the rest, we can only reiterate an established truth: that documents elaborated on the basis of delicate compromise have generally the distinction of failing to respond to the expert and professional requirements of legal draughtsmen. We must see this broad compromise, as a whole, as reflecting the commitment by the members of the Working Group.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank all members of the Working Group for their tremendous contribution to the work of the Working Group; they were indefatigable in the attempt to seek compromise, and I wish publicly to recognize this.

I should like also to express my profound gratitude to the Under-Secretary-General who represents the Secretary-General in this effort for his co-operation, and also to the Secretary of the Working Group, Mr. Sammy K. Buo, for placing the expertise of the Secretariat at our full disposal.

I recommend the report of Working Group III to the Disarmament Commission for adoption.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): While congratulating my colleague, the representative of Cameroon, on the work he has done as Chairman of Working Group III, I should like to point out something which I consider to be basic to the whole question.

The Working Group states in its report

That ought to read, "... in the field of international security and disarmament". I shall explain why. We believe, and it is undoubtedly true, that disarmament can be achieved only as the result of international security. We cannot have disarmament without international security, and disarmament negotiations have always failed when they did not take account of the need for international security.

The whole of this work derives from the establishment of the Disarmament Commission, described in paragraph 118, Section IV, Machinery, of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly. But section IV, Machinery, is preceded in the Final Document by section II Declaration. The machinery has to follow the lines laid down in the Declaration, not go outside them. The lines laid down in the Declaration are that

"Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority. Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter". (resolution S-10/2, para. 13)

So, I emphasize, genuine and lasting peace can only be created not through disarmament but through the effective implementation of security system provided for in the Charter.

That is the basis of the Declaration, and it cannot be ignored when we move on to the machinery. This Commission is the machinery, and it cannot go beyond the Declaration.

That is why I say that paragraph 6 of the Working Group's report should be altered to give priority to international security. It should refer to the comprehensive review of the role of the United Nations in the field of international security and disarmament and then explain the importance of international security and the dependence of disarmament on international security.

I shall not go further into this subject, but I believe that it is vital to the whole matter, considering that the machinery - in other words, this Commission - is bound by the essentials of the Declaration, to which I have just referred.
Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to draw attention to paragraph 3, the fourth line of which states: "which are annexed to the present report" (A/CN.10/1985/CRP.5/Rev.1). I would ask that these words be deleted since, if we decide that all documents already published will be annexed, they will be mentioned as they appear in Informal Paper No. 4, "Annexes to the report of the Disarmament Commission". If we take a decision not to include them, they will not be included. Therefore I would ask that these words be deleted.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to make three brief comments.

First, I would request that a correction be made in the Spanish version of paragraph 8 so that the text may correspond to the English version. In the third line, the Spanish version reads: "be continued by the Commission as a matter of the highest priority". It should simply state: "as a matter of priority", in accordance with the English version, which is the original.

My second comment is that I wish to add my own delegation's congratulations to those already expressed by the representative of Cyprus to the Chairman of the Working Group on the way in which he conducted its work.

My third and last comment is that I wish also to express my delegation's support for the suggestion made, as stated in paragraph 7, that the publication entitled The United Nations and Disarmament be updated. We think this is very useful and would not be very costly. As we all know, there are already two volumes, the thicker one with a blue cover and the other one green, that is, the first supplement. In my view, it would be very useful to have a second supplement which would bring the work up to this year, 1985.

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): I am speaking as the representative of Cameroon rather than as Chairman of a Working Group. We have heard the report of the Chairman of the Working Group, in which he underlined the fact that the documentation that was submitted to this Working Group had special significance, because indeed they formed the basis of the discussions that took place. I am not trying to prejudge the decision that will be taken. I believe that the suggestion made by the representative of the Soviet Union should be suspended, because indeed it would prejudge the decision that still has to be taken on the question of the annexes. So I would suggest - and I appeal to him to accept my suggestion - that, if necessary, square brackets could be placed around the words but they should not be eliminated, because that would prejudge the final decision. They could be
eliminated if a decision is indeed taken that these documents should not be annexed, but we should not need to reopen this issue and re-establish them if in fact the decision is to the contrary.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am ready to agree that the adoption of the report of Working Group III be postponed until we settle this matter of documentation. It is hardly necessary to place any square brackets in the text we have already discussed. So let us continue our discussion of other items on the agenda, and when we settle the matter of documentation we will also settle the matter of the report of Working Group III.

Mr. de La BAUME (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation does not intend to raise here in plenary meeting the many faults of style contained in the French text of the reports. However, I must point out certain obscurities which really render the French texts virtually incomprehensible. Unfortunately this is the case with the last sentence of the French text of paragraph 7. I could read it out and request a correction, but perhaps to avoid taking up the Commission's time I should make a proposal directly to the Secretariat. I should like to point out that in all these reports before us there are really far too many inaccuracies, mistranslations and actual errors.

Mr. SIMPSON (Ghana): My delegation is a little confused now, after the comments made by the representative of the Soviet Union. It was my understanding that we were proceeding on the basis of adopting the reports and then returning to take a decision on what we should or should not do with the annexes. Now I have heard the suggestion that we should suspend the adoption of the report of Working Group III until we have a decision on the annexes. I wonder whether you could clarify the situation, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: The position, as I understand it, is that we agree to suspend the question of whether or not to have annexes to our report until we come to the end of the process during which we are adopting the reports on specific agenda items. My understanding also is that, after we have adopted the reports on specific agenda items, we would be required to adopt our report as a whole. I hope that before we come to that last stage we shall have taken a decision about the annexes. In the circumstances I would request the representative of the Soviet Union to review, if possible, the proposal he has just made, namely, not to adopt or take action on this report at this stage, since, as I have indicated, we will come to the last stage at which we should adopt the report of the Commission as a whole.
Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to your request and the proposal of my good friend, the representative of Cameroon, Mr. Enfo. Let us adopt the report of Working Group III, putting in square brackets the words on the last line of paragraph 3, and let us revert to that later.

The CHAIRMAN: We have a proposal made by the representative of Cyprus about an addition to the second line of paragraph 6. However, I would point out that it is my understanding — and I will stand corrected if the Chairman of that Group rules me out of order — that the first two lines of paragraph 6 refer to the item as described. Therefore it may not be possible to make a change in those two lines, since they refer to a description of the item, which is "Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament". That is the description of the agenda item.
Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): It need not be in the first two lines of paragraph 6. In place of "convinced that the process of disarmament affected the vital security interests of all States", in the third and fourth lines, we could say "convinced that the process of international security affected the whole question of disarmament".

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon, Chairman of Working Group III): I want to explain that this report does no more than reflect what was in fact discussed in the Working Group, and I think it would not be very prudent for us to introduce ideas that did not come out of that effort. The Working Group adopted this report bearing in mind the discussion that took place. If this idea has to be introduced then I think that when delegations make their final comments they should be free to say what they think may happen in addition to what has been included in the report. It should be reflected in the usual way rather than by introducing it into the report as if the issue had been discussed.

I should like to thank the representative of the Soviet Union. I am informed that what I said in English - a foreign language to me - did not come out too well in some languages. What I meant was that it should be left as it is, but on the understanding that if a decision to the contrary is taken it will then be eliminated. I deeply appreciate his understanding and the fact that there is no disagreement between friends.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope that the explanation given by the representative of Cameroon as Chairman of Working Group III is acceptable to the representative of Cyprus and that we can proceed.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I would be quite willing to agree with my colleague from Cameroon, but in some way or other it must be shown somewhere in this document that the security system provided for in the Charter, as so explicitly stated in paragraph 13 of the Final Document, must not be forgotten; it should not be changed to security resulting from disarmament. We know that disarmament brings security, but the question is, what makes disarmament possible? It is international security, and this should appear in the report, because this is the essence of the Final Document and appears in the declaration.

The CHAIRMAN: As the Chairman of Working Group III just explained, the report reflects the discussions in the Working Group. The Group held several meetings - seven, if I recall correctly - and the report of the discussions in the Working Group was then adopted at a lengthy meeting yesterday. To use the words of
(The Chairman)

the Chairman of Working Group III, it would not be prudent to introduce changes at this stage when we are in the process of adopting the reports of the Working Groups. I am sure that the representative of Cyprus, who is making a very valid point, can include it in his concluding statement tomorrow.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I should have been at the meetings of the Working Group and raised the point there, but now I can only refer to it.

The CHAIRMAN: I am most grateful to the representative of Cyprus for his cooperation.

May I take it that, with the understanding on the last line of paragraph 3—namely, "which are annexed to the present report"—the Commission wishes to adopt the report of Working Group III?

The report was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Next is the report on item 8, entitled "Curbing the naval arms race: limitation and reduction of naval armaments and extension of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans" (A/CN.10/1985/CRP.6).

Members will recall that the Commission decided to consider this item in plenary meetings, at the end of which I, as Chairman of the Commission, would prepare the report on the item in consultation with friends of the Chairman and other interested delegations. Pursuant to the decision of the Commission and following the exchanges in plenary meetings on the item, I undertook consultations with friends of the Chairman and other interested delegations and the report to which I have referred is the result.

I am informed that there is a typographical error in paragraph 5, third line from the bottom, where the words "in that area" should read "in this area".

Mr. CAMPOA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The item on the naval arms race was the subject of two plenary meetings, at which we heard important views from major Powers and from States that are not big Powers. The considerations expressed at that time are in the verbatim records of this Commission's meetings. I recall that when the work of the Disarmament Commission was organized it was suggested that the Commission was not able to consider the issue because the report of the group of experts report was still pending. Some delegations, including my own, felt that discussion and consideration of this item was a beginning and that it was appropriate for such discussion to begin at this session of the Disarmament Commission.
It is my delegation's wish that the group of experts should meet, complete its report and submit it to the Assembly and that the item should continue to be given due consideration in the future. But it is also my delegation's wish that the group of experts should be informed of what was said at the two plenary meetings of the Commission. I believe that it would be of benefit to them to be aware of the views and opinions expressed at this session of the Disarmament Commission.
Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): I have one observation to make about this report. I note that there is no suggestion in it that the working paper referred to at the end of paragraph 2, that is document A/CN.10/73, be annexed to the report. Therefore, I do not see why this working paper was included in informal paper No. 4, bearing in mind the criteria mentioned by the Secretary of the Commission in his statement earlier this afternoon.

Mr. THIELICKE (German Democratic Republic): I should like to take this opportunity to remind the representative of the United Kingdom that within the framework of the discussion on item 8 in the contact group this question was discussed, and some delegations expressed the view that it was necessary that the working paper just mentioned should be included in the relevant part of the report. Of course, we were unable to take a decision on the matter in our small working party, so the question was referred to the plenary. I think the working paper should be included in the report because many delegations have expressed the view here that the paper is quite relevant to the problem under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: In reply to the question posed by the representative of the United Kingdom, it is my recollection that when we were discussing the draft report, the question of the inclusion or non-inclusion of this working paper in the report was taken up and it was agreed that we should take up the question of annexes in the plenary. That is a matter on which the Commission will have to take a decision, and I hope it will be able to do so after we have gone through the reports on the agenda items.

If there are no other comments, I take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report (A/CN.10/1985/CRP.6).

The report was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Finally, we have the report on the "Review and Appraisal of the Implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade". As it will be recalled, the Commission decided to devote two plenary meetings to consideration of this item. The Commission further decided that the Chairman would undertake thereafter the drafting of a report, in consultation with his friends and other interested delegations. Pursuant to that decision, I had consultations with friends of the Chairman and interested delegations and later, with the very able assistance of the representative of Nigeria, we were able to agree on the paper which is now contained in document A/CN.10/1985/CRP.7.
Mr. SHARMA (India): I should like to request that paragraph 2 (b) of document A/CN.10/1985/CRP.7, be amended to read:

"Working paper submitted by India and Nigeria (A/CN.10/75), annexed to this report."

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Commission.

Mr. ALEM (Secretary of the Commission): I wish to refer to paragraph 2 (a) of the same document. In view of the fact that some of the replies had not been received when document A/CN.10/68 and Add.1-4 was issued, that document does not contain all the replies that had been received before the end of the session. I consider, therefore, that the words "Add.1-4" should be replaced by the words, "and addenda."

The CHAIRMAN: Subject to the understanding that we reached with regard to annexes, as spelled out during our discussion on the report relating to the review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament, I take it that the report (A/CN.10/1985/CRP.7) is adopted.

The report was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We now turn to some other chapters of the draft report of the Disarmament Commission, which are contained in document A/CN.10/1985/CRP.1. I call on the Rapporteur of the Commission, Mr. Laclaustra.

Mr. Laclaustra (Spain), Rapporteur of the Commission (interpretation from Spanish): It is a great pleasure to introduce the draft report of the Disarmament Commission (A/CN.10/1985/CRP.1), which has been distributed to the Commission. This draft contains four chapters: I. Introduction; II. Organization and work of the 1985 session; III. Documentation, and; IV. Conclusions and recommendations. Of course, this draft report follows the format of previous years. We have just the basic structure of the Commission's report, and, as is pointed out in this document, the reports of the subsidiary bodies that have been considered will be added, starting with paragraph 27. There are also some blanks that will be filled in by the Secretariat, as necessary, when the final report is completed.

I recommend this draft report to the Commission for adoption.

Before concluding, I should like to express my thanks to the Secretariat for its valuable co-operation in this work.
The CHAIRMAN: The Rapporteur of the Commission has just introduced those parts of the draft report contained in document A/CN.10/1985/CRP.1. If there are no comments I shall take it that they are acceptable to the Commission.

The Commission will now take up the question of the annexes.

The Secretariat has been able to gather the information requested of it, and I am told that if we include the documents listed in Informal Paper No. 4, the additional four documents it has been requested be included in the Commission's report, which number 27 pages, the cost of reproducing these internally in the report itself will be $3,068. As the Secretary of the Commission pointed out earlier, these documents already exist in translation, so the additional cost will only be for reproducing them in the report, which will be done internally.

Having said that I should like to make an appeal to the Commission. I think that this additional cost is nominal. I think that we can debate endlessly on the interpretation of the guidelines the General Assembly has given us. I would therefore urge that we continue the practice followed by the Commission in earlier years and include these documents in the report itself. May I just state that that will of course not include the replies to the Secretary-General's note verbale, to which the representative of the Soviet Union made reference.

Mr. ELBE (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to your suggestion, I think we should all realize that several delegations have expressed very precise views on the subject-matter at this meeting. The matter has also been discussed in the various Groups. I think it would be unfair to expect the delegations that have voiced strong feelings now to take different views. There is no urgency on the subject-matter since we have two or three more plenary meetings coming. May I suggest that we defer a decision on the matter so as to give delegations a chance to consult among themselves.

Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, I have a question for you. What documents is it intended we retain in the annex to the report of the Disarmament Commission? You noted that the replies of Governments to the Secretary-General would not be annexed. Could you be kind enough to enumerate the documents that would be annexed?
A/CN.10/PV.97
62-65

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the Secretary to reply to that question.

Mr. ALEM (Secretary of the Commission): The documents concerned are A/CN.10/71, A/CN.10/73, A/CN.10/74 and A/CN.10/75.

Mr. DEPASSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): In that case, in order to ensure the principle of non-discrimination - on which, I think we agree - we would request that document A/CN.10/1985/CRP.2 also be reproduced.

Mr. PAVLOVSKY (Czechoslovakia): Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding of your proposal that you suggested the inclusion of all the documents listed in part III of document A/CN.10/1985/CRP.1, section B, "Documents submitted by Member States", which would then include all documents from A/CN.10/71 to sub-section (e), which of course is now A/CN.10/75.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary.

Mr. ALEM (Secretary of the Commission): I am sorry; I did not understand the question of the representative of Czechoslovakia. In document A/CN.10/1985/CRP.1 are listed the four documents, except A/CN.10/75, which is probably subsumed under (e), and since this report has been drafted before any decision on this matter has been taken, the blank will be filled in keeping with the Commission's decision.

As for the request of the representative of Belgium, if it is the wish of the Commission that it be included, it will be included.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): I should just like to say that we support the proposal made just now by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany. We think that in practice it may well expedite our work.

If what you suggested just now, Mr. Chairman, regarding the inclusion of annexes to our report, would mean the exclusion of the documents which the Working Group on item 7, that is Working Group III, recommended be annexed to the present report - that is in paragraph 3 of document A/CN.10/1985/CRP.5/Rev.1 - we would be opposed to that suggestion. We wish the recommendation of Working Group III to stand with regard to these documents.

Mr. PAVLOVSKY (Czechoslovakia): I regret that my remarks led to confusion on the part of the Secretariat. I said, very simply, that it was my understanding of your proposal, Mr. Chairman, that we should follow past practice, that by doing so we would annex to our report all the documents submitted by Member States, from document A/CN.10/71 to the last document, which is now document A/CN.10/75, without any exceptions. I think it is clear now.
MR. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not think that this is such a difficult question that a solution must be postponed until tomorrow or the day after tomorrow, or even later.

In the light of the information given by the secretariat that the additional cost would be relatively small - $3,086 - the Soviet delegation proposes that the annex should include all the documents which have been submitted to the Commission and which the delegations concerned request be included.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, you could put this simple question: is the Commission prepared to exclude the documents now listed in this paper? I have the impression that delegations are not prepared to do that. So the only alternative is to include all the documents.

I think it is unnecessary to repeat that not a single delegation, including that of the Soviet Union, would condone discrimination. That is why I propose again that, in view of the rather modest additional cost, we should adhere to the practice of past years and include all the documents; and that at the very beginning of the 1986 session of the Commission we should deal with this question of the recommendation of the General Assembly. This year let us adhere to the practice followed in 1984, 1983 and earlier years.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the Commission to postpone a decision on this question, or is the Commission in a position to take the decision that this year we should not change the practice followed in earlier years but at the beginning of the next session should consider the question of economy in documentation and take the appropriate decision?

It would of course be most welcome if the Commission wished to take a decision now. If, however, the Commission wishes to postpone taking a decision, I hope it will be possible to take it first thing tomorrow morning, before we begin the last part of our work: the concluding statements.

It appears that no one wishes to speak. My experience in smaller groups - contact groups, and so forth - is that silence means that we follow past practice.

MR. ELBE (Federal Republic of Germany): Your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that we should sin just once more might be the easiest way, but I think that it is at least a morally doubtful way.

At this juncture I would merely remind you, Mr. Chairman, that my delegation made a formal request for the adjournment of this debate and that the request was seconded.
The CHAIRMAN: We shall then postpone the adoption of the Commission's report as a whole to tomorrow morning. I hope that we shall be able to begin tomorrow morning's meeting by taking a decision on the annexes and then shall adopt the report. Thereafter we shall hear the concluding statements. I hope it will be possible to complete all those statements by the end of our afternoon meeting tomorrow. Some representatives had expressed the wish to speak on Friday, but I would appeal to them to do so tomorrow afternoon. I think we could save the Commission and the United Nations a great deal of money if we could complete the session tomorrow. We have been focussing on the question of saving money, and finishing our work tomorrow afternoon would be in line with that aim.

Mr. THIELICKE (German Democratic Republic): I should like to ask the secretariat if at the beginning of tomorrow morning's meeting it could tell us what it has cost to print the verbatim record of this meeting today. The greater part of the meeting has been devoted to a discussion of the question of the annexes. Therefore, it would be quite interesting to compare the cost of printing all these pages of the verbatim record of today's meeting with the cost of including some additional documents in the annexes to the report.

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): My delegation is in favour of saving money. I would recall, however, that Working Group III indirectly transmitted a message that it had not had enough time to conclude its work. I am wondering what impression we shall be giving the General Assembly if, on the one hand, we are so conscious of the financial implications of holding one extra meeting of the Commission and, on the other hand, we say that we do not have enough time to discuss a matter to which some priority was accorded.

I do not want to block any consensus on your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, but I think we have to be extremely careful not to give the impression that we came here for a holiday and were in such a hurry to go home that we refused to conclude our work on very important issues.

Mr. DEPASSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I hope that it would not involve the United Nations in too much expense if I asked the Secretariat to produce for tomorrow morning's meeting an updated "Informal Paper No. 4/Rev.1", containing the actual list of annexes. I think that if this list is drafted on the basis of the principles put forward today, we shall be able to reach agreement immediately in the Disarmament Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: The secretariat has noted the requests that have been made.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.