Fifteenth special session

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Saturday, 25 June 1988, at 5 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

- Statement by the Chairman
The meeting was called to order at 3.25 a.m. on Sunday, 26 June.*

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: Earlier in the evening I sought the Committee’s permission to enter into intensive consultations with some delegations in order to determine whether there was a basis for arriving at a consensus on a concluding document, on which we have been working during the past few days. The Committee was good enough to permit me to do so. I undertook those consultations, which lasted for well over five hours, and, despite their length and the sincerity and determination with which delegations participated in them, it has not been possible to establish a consensus on a concluding document. I say this with the utmost regret, because I think that all delegations were extremely co-operative; they showed the maximum possible understanding. However, despite that, it has not been possible to reach agreement.

With the Committee’s permission, I need to convey this information to the General Assembly in plenary meeting.

Perhaps at this late hour we should not take too much time over adopting a report, which we need to do, a technical report which is factual in nature.

Mrs. THEURIN (Sweden): I understand the problems you have been facing, Mr. Chairman. I must admit that the work that has been done has been very good. My delegation would request that we be given more time to continue our common efforts to reach an agreement on the concluding document. The progress in the deliberations tonight has been considerable, and it should not be impossible to solve the remaining problems within a limited time scheduled. I am convinced of that, because it was possible to bring the Stockholm Conference to a successful conclusion only after the clock had been stopped for a considerable time. The clock

* See A/S-15/PV.22.
has now been stopped for two and a half hours. My delegation feels that the
same procedure could be tried tonight. I propose that you, Sir, as Chairman, be
given four more hours to settle the outstanding questions.

I could accept our finishing now if we could not solve the problems in
substance, but so far that is not the reason why we now face an end to the
session. The issue is in fact that we are not allowing ourselves enough time.
Therefore, I request that we have four more hours to settle the outstanding
questions, and the Committee of the Whole should thereafter reconvene.

To be honest, it is impossible to explain to my Government and the peoples of
the world that owing to the lack of a few hours we were not willing to discuss the
remaining questions. There are only a few of them, and I am convinced that they
could be solved.
Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): With all due respect for, and appreciation of, the viewpoint and proposal of the representative of Sweden, I wish to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that we have been working since yesterday morning non-stop, without a glimmer of hope of finding agreement on many issues. Many efforts have been made - not only today and not only in the last few hours - and I do not believe the problems will be solved in the next four hours. We are convinced that what has not been solved in the past few days - indeed, during the entire session - cannot be solved during the next few hours.

Therefore, I request that these discussions be put to an end. Let us take up your proposal, Mr. Chairman, and report to the Assembly in plenary meeting the results we have achieved after many efforts, without any progress towards any kind of agreement on those complicated issues which are still outstanding.

Even assuming that after four hours those delegations holding discussions in a small room next door came to an agreement, that would not mean that all the other delegations here would agree with them; it would only mean a new discussion after four hours' suspension. If a new debate is to be opened, that will require even more time. If after one or two more days we reached agreement, we should then have to return to our Governments to obtain instructions on a concluding document on which we can agree, but which it is impossible to agree on, as the facts have shown. We seem to be in a vicious circle. Let us break that circle; let us not continue in it indefinitely.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation supports the proposal made by the representative of Sweden. This is too important a time in international relations, when for the first time they are entering a period of genuine nuclear disarmament, and what is needed is to have bilateral and multilateral disarmament machinery put into
operation. This special session of the General Assembly faces very important problems, not merely to assess the work done, but to lay down guidelines for the future. Finally, we must of course take into account the fact that we have too many positive things going for us; we do not have confrontation on disarmament. Moreover, hard experience shows that it is possible for general ideas to be agreed upon in a general document.

Therefore, the Soviet delegation is prepared to co-operate with all those who are striving to find agreement, striving to have our Organization indeed be "a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations", not only in disarmament but in all other areas of international activity, and willing to engage in constructive co-operation and to work without interruption on a text. We expect the same of other delegations; we are prepared to work with all of them.

Mr. ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia): I, too, support the proposal by the representative of Sweden that we should continue our work. We are at a very difficult moment. On the basis of yesterday's work and that of the last several hours, we cannot say that we have reached a stage when any further possible progress has been blocked. We have been able to discuss the most difficult issues, the most difficult paragraphs, and it is possible to find a way to agree. Of course, we have not been able to discuss everything. I agree that - at this moment at least - that was mainly because of lack of time.

In this situation I think it is our responsibility to do whatever is possible. We have not come to the end. We have not done everything possible. The paragraphs that we have discussed, with the exception of the last two or three, which we have considered and left open, still do not bring us to the end.
Therefore, it is our responsibility to try to continue and on that basis find out whether we have really come to the end, in the sense that we cannot reach consensus on your paper, Sir. In my view, we cannot at this moment come to that conclusion, and it is the responsibility of all of us to continue.

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): I must say that if the last five hours of discussion have shown anything they have shown that there are deep and substantive differences. We do not believe that three or four more hours will change that situation. We are being asked to say that there can be a consensus, when there is no such consensus. I do not believe that we should deceive ourselves or others.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): It had been my intention to support the Swedish proposal, for the simple reason that I should not have liked it to be said that we failed in our task for want of four hours. If the representative of Sweden had the very strong feeling that with four more hours we could reach a consensus, it would be unforgivable for me, at least, historically speaking, if I did not give myself and the rest of us four more hours to reach agreement. Therefore, I was going to appeal to my friend, the representative of Syria, kindly to agree and give us four more hours, if there were any possibility of finding a consensus. But, in view of what our colleague from the United States has just said, I now leave it to you, Sir, and in particular to the representative of Sweden, as to whether she wishes to pursue her proposal at this stage.
Mr. MASHHADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): For almost a month the eyes of the world have been focused on what is happening here. The outstanding number of non-governmental organizations participating and the attention given to the special session demand that we try our best to come up with a document, as a reflection of our appreciation of their generous hope and affection. We therefore support the view expressed by the representative of Sweden in that respect, and we hope the international community will be given more of a chance.

Mr. AL-KITAL (Iraq): We have been working very hard, not only today but throughout last week and the week before, all the while hoping that we might reach a successful conclusion by agreeing on a set of principles, recommendations and so forth to form our final document. We are not tired of the exercise, and I think one can always find some energy left within oneself to push on, even without sleep, if only for one night. We have had such experiences before. But to find the necessary energy we must have some indication that success is possible.

In view of some of the statements we have just heard and in view of what we heard during consultations, it is quite clear that the differences are of a fundamental nature. I am not at all sure that an hour, or two, or three - or even a full day or two - will solve the problems. I should therefore say that it may not be advisable at this time to continue this exercise. Nevertheless, as my colleague from India said earlier, I am in the hands of the Chairman and will accept his decision.
Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka): A few hours ago, during the brief recess we had, I walked across the street and bought a copy of Sunday's edition of The New York Times. It made some very startling predictions about the fate of this special session. I do not have the courage to make such startling prophesies about the eventual outcome of the session, but certainly at around 6.30 or 7 p.m. yesterday prospects seemed very bleak. I think there were some 15 or 16 paragraphs that were supposed to be absolutely intractable and impossible of solution. No one in his right mind felt we should be able within a few hours to reduce the number of these difficult paragraphs to something like four or five. If one took the time spent even in this little discussion we have had, it might not be too rash or optimistic to think that with a few more hours we might be able to narrow some of the differences. It is true that many of them are fundamental, but I think on several we seem extremely close to reaching some sort of language that might satisfy everybody. If prospects were grim earlier yesterday evening, they have certainly changed remarkably; a few hours ago there were even optimistic feelings that we might be able to wrap up a decent document by about 2.30 a.m.

I wish also to support very strongly the statements of the representatives of Sweden, India and others suggesting that we give ourselves this one little chance and extend the session by a few hours.

The CHAIRMAN: In the rules of procedure we adopted during the preparatory phase of our work we agreed that as far as possible we would take decisions on the basis of consensus. There is no consensus on the proposal made by the representative of Sweden. In the circumstances, I am in the hands of the Committee of the Whole, and I would like the views of members on how this particular request is to be handled.
Mr. ENGG (Cameroon): My delegation has listened to the proposals that have been made. We participated, Sir, in your consultations and were gratified by them. We had hoped that at this meeting we would now get a clear indication of what delegations felt with regard to the outstanding problems before us. I do not wish to address that question now. I wanted to ask how the four hours are to be used. Is it proposed that we continue to sit here for another four hours? Is it proposed that we adjourn now and meet again later today for a four-hour meeting? Is it proposed that the Committee of the Whole meet for four hours followed by a plenary meeting to close the session, which means additional time? I think some clarification is necessary.

But I think that before we take a decision either way we must reflect very carefully on the balance of thinking that exists here. My delegation is an optimistic delegation, but at nearly 4 o'clock in the morning, having gone through the experiences of the day, we find it extremely difficult indeed to be too enthusiastic one way or the other. We are prepared to co-operate if we are asked to sit, but we should like to know exactly what the proposal is, and whether those who are against the proposal by Sweden oppose it on the grounds that they are convinced that we will not succeed and that they are not in a position to continue to negotiate. Or are they merely expressing pessimism on the basis of what they have seen yesterday and today? If it is a question of pessimism, I urge them please to keep an open mind; but if their opposition is based on the conviction that they will not be in a position to make any further moves then we ourselves must wonder about the utility of insisting on our meeting if some partners are convinced there is no use in doing so.
Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): In response to the statement of the representative of India, I wish to make it clear that my statement was based on the evaluation the Chairman made at the beginning of this meeting that differences were so wide that consensus would be difficult to achieve and that he wished to report that situation to the General Assembly. I did not say anything to indicate that we were opposed to extending the session by four hours, or two days, or two weeks. We want to see this session succeed; we have contributed in a positive spirit with a view to achieving success, but the Chairman's evaluation gave us the impression that consensus would be very difficult to achieve.

If there is a general feeling in favour of extending the session, we hope the extension will be for a few days, not merely for a few hours, so we can conduct further consultations, study the results of those consultations, and refer back to our Governments for instructions on the final document. It is up to the Chairman in his wisdom to decide on this matter. We will support any decision he might make.
The CHAIRMAN: I put the question to the Committee of the Whole; I have not been able to discern a consensus on the proposal of the representative of Sweden.

I call upon the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Mr. TERAI (Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)): In the past few hours a great deal has been achieved; we must admit that. I do not believe that four hours will make any difference; I admit that as well. But what the Committee is ruling out is the possibility of granting more time so that those with differences can perhaps have Sunday and Monday to reach their Governments and consult with their Heads of State or Government and then come back to work on Tuesday morning or afternoon. This is a very important session. As the representative of Sweden has said, the entire world is looking forward to success for this special session on disarmament, particularly in the light of what was achieved when the two super-Powers met and came up with something that was almost positive, but very welcome.

I suggest that there be an extension of more than four hours; I fully agree that four hours are not going to change anything, especially now that everybody is fast asleep and now that is the weekend and they might be going to the beach.

I want to be very serious. We are told that at one time in history somebody stopped the sun. Now the Committee is stopping the clock and can stop it for a few hours more - unless somebody is determined to frustrate the work of the special session, in which case it would be a waste of time. If the political will is there, why not give it a try?
Mr. FAN Guoxiang (China) (interpretation from Chinese): We have noted that some delegations have made pessimistic evaluations and that it will be difficult to reach consensus on our document. We do not intend to underestimate that difficulty. None the less, considering the expectations of the international community and the importance of the question of disarmament, the Chinese delegation is willing to agree to the proposal submitted by the representative of Sweden that we add four hours or one day to our work. The decision, of course, is up to the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not up to me to determine this. It is a question I have put to the Committee of the Whole. There has been a proposal; there have been statements to the contrary. We agreed to work, as far as possible, on the basis of consensus. There is no consensus, and I should like to be advised what recommendation to make to the General Assembly, which, in fact, must take a decision about an extension.

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): The discussion that is going on at the moment can be interpreted only as a reflection of the feeling of all of us: that is the feeling of fear about how the world will interpret the failure of the General Assembly at this special session to arrive at an agreed document on the projection of our activities into the future. It is also a reflection, I believe, of a real desire to make a final attempt to reach agreement. As has been said, it would in a way be tragic that at a time when the process of disarmament - for which many of our countries have worked very hard and which the world has received with relief and hope - has finally started after so many decades, we should be unable to reach a consensus agreement. My delegation is ready to continue, either for four hours or - which is probably better - on Monday, and to propose to the General Assembly an extension of a few days, two days for example.
Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): My delegation would like to thank the representative of Sweden for the proposal she made. It expresses the sentiment of the participants in the special session, sentiments that indicate how very anxious we are to ensure that the special session should end on a note satisfactory not only to those of us who are participating but also to the constituency for disarmament outside the United Nations.

Obviously, the success of the effort we should make were the proposal to be approved would depend on the willingness of all participants to continue that effort in good faith and in good spirits, to ensure that we do not find ourselves where we are now at the end of the extended period. My delegation would certainly have no problem with continuing, if we have clear indications that a useful purpose would be served by such a continuation.

You, Sir, rightly put the question of what we should do in the light of the fact that objections have been raised. I wonder if the Secretariat is in a position to advise us in this situation.
The decision during the preparatory stage of the special session to take decisions by consensus seems to my delegation to be applicable to decisions on matters of substance, but this is a procedural one. I wonder whether the Secretariat can advise us how this was handled in the past, because in the past special sessions were in a similar situation and had to ask for an extension of time.

I must say that the point made by the representative of Yugoslavia is pertinent; I think it was underlined by the representative of Cameroon. Is it enough to ask for a four-hour extension? Can we accomplish anything in the next four hours in view of the fact that we are all weary, very tired, and will need at least to get some sleep before we resume work. Of course, my delegation would be prepared to work all of Sunday, if there is agreement to do so. But we must first get clarification on whether this is an issue that requires consensus or a decision that can be taken in the context of the normal rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Perhaps we can get some clarification from a representative of the Secretariat.

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

Mr. PRANDLER (Secretary of the Committee of the Whole): In response to the question of the representative of Nigeria, I should like to point out the following. As the Chairman has already said, the major rule that has guided us during the session, as adopted by the Preparatory Committee for the Third Special Session and endorsed by the General Assembly, is that on all substantive issues every effort should be made to take decisions by consensus. Therefore, as far as this specific issue is concerned, technically speaking this question is a procedural one.

On the other hand, if I may express my very humble approach and
interpretation, at the same time the question has very broad implication so far as the substantive issues are concerned. However, it is for the Committee of the Whole to make the final determination.

I should like to repeat that, basing ourselves on the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, technically speaking this question is a procedural one and the Committee of the Whole could proceed to take a vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is back to the Committee of the Whole, and I think that body has to take a position.

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, you yourself have pointed out the absence of consensus. I believe that we should preserve the consensus principle for both procedural and substantive issues, following the precedents of the first and second special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD I and SSOD II) and, additionally, the Preparatory Committee for SSOD III.

Mr. KATEKA (United Republic of Tanzania): It is late and we are very tired, to the extent that we no longer even follow the list of speakers.

I think we have a problem here: we are raising procedural issues, we have a request for four hours, and a proposal for the extension of the session. None of these has been decided; everything is being thrown back and forth; and we are sitting here wasting more time. If the request for four hours is to be granted, let it be done and done expeditiously. If an extension of the session is to take place, then we should proceed to the plenary meeting. If we are saying we have failed, then we should convene in plenary meeting to conclude the business. But for heaven's sake let us move from this room and go somewhere else or go to sleep.
Mr. SYLLA (Senegal) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, you have spoken twice; in the interval delegations have stated their views.

As I understand it, the situation is the following. You said at the beginning that you had conducted consultations for five hours and - in your words - with sincerity and determination. In spite of that, it has been impossible to reach consensus. Then we heard the representative of the United States, who said that we should not delude ourselves, that it was simply not possible to reach consensus on the document before us. We have also heard from a number of other delegations. After that you, Mr. Chairman, spoke again and said there was no consensus on the document before us. Some delegations have requested a four-hour extension, others an extension of one day or two days.

As we understand the situation, it is not possible to reach consensus on the document that has been put before us. We have been working on this document for six weeks, and today we are unable to reach consensus on it. Will a four-hour, a one-day, or a two-day extension get us anywhere? I am asking the question because I was not involved in the discussions that you have conducted, Sir. The meeting was suspended a little while ago, but I am going by what you have just reported to us. On that basis, I think it is impossible to reach consensus on this document. We regret that very much. We would have wished for agreement on a document which, while perhaps not reflecting all the views of the delegations here, would at least have indicated consensus on essentials. But, as you have said, this is not possible. There is no need for us to harbour illusions; we cannot reach consensus, whether or not we extend the session by four hours, a day or two days. From the statements that have just been made, it is clear that no useful purpose would be served. It seems that we shall simply have to admit that we have failed. We cannot produce a document; hence there is no need to go on.
I think what we should do is return to the General Assembly and report that we have not reached agreement on a final document; the session would thereby come to an end. To make statements now for a four-hour, one-day or two-day extension is fine; for we would have liked to produce a document. But that is not possible. At least that is how we see the present situation.

Obviously, nobody wants to be blamed for the failure of this session, but the present situation is perfectly clear. We have not reached consensus thus far and we do not think a four-hour, a one-day or a two-day extension will make that possible.

We have not reached agreement on some points. That is a fact; it is regrettable, but that is what has happened. So let us return to the General Assembly and report that we have not reached agreement on a document. Perhaps we shall be able to do so next time. We regret it, but that is the situation.

That is how we understand the present situation, and we think that is what we ought to do rather than waste more time here listening to representatives say, "Well, perhaps we should have a four-hour, one-day, two-day or three-day extension". If we are wrong, please correct us. Otherwise, let us go back to the General Assembly and say we have not reached agreement on this question and, the situation being what it is, we will part on those terms.

Mr. ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia): I am not certain whether I should speak now, since you may prefer, Mr. Chairman, to answer the questions put by the previous speaker. Just the same, I shall make two comments.

First - and this is my impression - there was no definite stand by anybody that consensus was impossible; there are serious doubts, but I do not think there was a specific expression of impossibility. I may be wrong, but that is my understanding. The fact is that we did not reach consensus on the whole document
but we reached consensus on nine paragraphs in a preliminary way. We stopped with another three paragraphs, but we did so because of lack of time - even if it may soon be proved that that was not the only reason.

My second comment is about a consensus on the decision whether or not to continue. There were some statements against, followed by a debate. I think it would be worthwhile to ask, now, for an indication of those who think we should not continue - not in the sense of doubt but of a definite stand, because consensus does not mean the same as voting; consensus means that nobody objects, even when there are some hesitations.

Mr. GHAESKHAN (India): While technically it may be possible for us to take a vote, I wonder, in view of the clear position of the United States representative in the person of no less than Ambassador Walters himself, whether any purpose would be served by insisting on a vote and embarrassing the United States delegation when we know that we shall get nowhere. I also agree that, in view of the very honest position of the United States delegation, at this stage there is perhaps no point to having an extension of four hours or of one or two days.

However, I wonder whether the session might not adjourn until a more propitious moment in 1989, instead of declaring it closed now. Maybe in 1989 the atmosphere will be better. We would thus not have to say the session ended in failure.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to support the proposal just made by the representative of India.
Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): I think if we have demonstrated anything today it is the fact that we still have stored energy inside us. At this time in the morning we are still talking, engaging in a very animated debate on whether or not we should meet. I wish we had addressed some of those problems now and had a clearer atmosphere. It is my delegation's opinion that we could go on endlessly on the question whether or not the Committee of the Whole should propose an extension to the plenary General Assembly. Indeed, we can probably save some time and energy by going to the Assembly and by you, Mr. Chairman, reporting just what you have told us, namely, that we are unable to get a consensus within the allotted time; that you put the question whether or not we should ask for more time, as proposed by a delegation and amended; and also that in the allotted time you were unable to obtain a consensus on that. Then the General Assembly on its own authority can decide whether or not to extend the session.

We should not waste time here arguing on what obviously is a procedural question and go to the General Assembly and repeat the performance there. We have a lot of energy that, I think, should be used in negotiations. However, I shall not pass judgement on that.

There are two more speakers and I propose that after they have spoken - and if there is no new element - we request you, Mr. Chairman, to report to the plenary Assembly and adjourn.

Mr. DIFFOT (Gabon) (interpretation from French): There are failures that are instructive, and I think we must in all honesty, objectivity and humility accept reality as it presents itself. A document that attracted the kind of consensus that did not reach deep inside everyone's heart would only deceive everyone - and deceit is not what we need here. Let us draw the conclusion from this failure; it may even perhaps be instructive for the future.
In any case, for my delegation one conclusion emerges: disarmament will not soon become a reality because certain circles cannot come together in unanimity. Hence our delegation would ask that the Chairman give us a summary of those points on which agreement and unanimous understanding could not be reached - that is, as my delegation requested before the previous suspension, a summary of those points on which unanimous agreement was reached and those points that divide the group.

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt): My delegation merely wishes to support the proposal of the representative of India and to complement it by adding that we should now adjourn and go immediately into a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Gabon has requested a summary. I think the best I can do is merely to draw his attention to the work that was done in the Committee of the Whole up until late this evening and to the reading of the text drawn up during that meeting and the positions that emerged at the end of that reading. I think that that is the best summary I can give him of where we stand.

I believe that, after this discussion, it should be possible for us to agree that the Committee of the Whole will report to the General Assembly that it has not been possible to come to an agreement on any concluding document. It will also report to the Assembly that it has also not been able to come to a firm agreement on a proposal that the special session be extended.

Having said that, I think we should now proceed with the adoption of the technical part of our report, which is contained in document A/S-15/AC.1/L.1 (Part 1)/Corr.1. I call upon the Rapporteur to introduce the report.
Mr. Núñez Mosquera (Cuba), Rapporteur (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour to place before the Committee of the Whole the draft report A/S-15/AC.1/L.1 (Part I)/Corr.1, and (Part III). Part II of the draft report would have contained the recommendations of the Committee of the Whole to the fifteenth special session of the General Assembly. However, in spite of intense efforts on the part of all delegations, efforts that were reflected in the statement made at the beginning of this meeting by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, that was not possible.

The draft report objectively reflects the work of the Committee of the Whole over the past few weeks. It is an expression of the efforts of all delegations. The draft report contains three general chapters. Chapter I, "Introduction", consists of 14 paragraphs and provides a brief description of the work of the Committee of the Whole, beginning with its establishment by the General Assembly on 31 May 1988 and through its meeting of 20 June 1988. The first chapter mentions, inter alia, the election of the Chairman, the 18 Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur. It also reports the decision to establish three working groups: Working Group I, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Davidson L. Hepburn, Bahamas, to deal with agenda item 10; Working Group II, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Paul-Joachim von Stülpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany, to deal with agenda items 12 and 15; and Working Group III, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Paul Bamela Engo of Cameroon, to deal with agenda items 13 and 14. Chapter I also mentions the decision of the Committee of the Whole to authorize its Chairman to request Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles of Mexico to conduct consultations on agenda item 11 and to report to the Committee of the Whole.

Chapter I also contains a listing of the documents before the Committee of the Whole relevant to agenda items 10 to 15. The documents were introduced in the General Assembly or in the Committee. In this connection, I should like to draw
representatives' attention to the following corrections that should be made in the text of the draft report. On page 7, following document A/S-15/47, the following documents, which were submitted when the draft report was being written, should be inserted:

"Letter dated 22 June 1988 from the Permanent Representative of the German Democratic Republic addressed to the Secretary-General (A/S-15/48)

"Letter dated 23 June 1988 from the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Portugal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly (A/S-15/49)".

On page 8, following the report of the Chairman of Working Group III (A/S-15/AC.1/21), the following documents, also submitted while the report was being drafted, should be inserted:

"Working paper submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (A/S-15/AC.1/22)

"Working paper submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (items 12 and 13) (A/S-15/AC.1/23)

"Working paper submitted by Australia, Canada and New Zealand (item 12) (A/S-15/AC.1/24)

"Proposal by Egypt (items 12 and 13) (A/S-15/AC.1/25)

"Proposal by Trinidad and Tobago (item 12) (A/S-15/AC.1/26)

"Proposal by Trinidad and Tobago (item 12) (A/S-15/AC.1/27)

"Proposal by Brazil (items 10 and 12) (A/S-15/AC.1/28)"

Chapter II of the draft report covers the work of the Committee of the Whole on agenda items 10 through 15. There is a brief report on the substantive work of the Working Groups and on the consultations conducted by Ambassador Garcia Robles.
Working Group I held 13 meetings between 6 and 17 June 1988, and the Committee of the Whole takes note of its report (A/S-15/AC.1/18) at its 8th meeting, on 20 June.

Working Group II held 11 meetings between 6 and 17 June 1988, and the Committee of the Whole took note of its report (A/S-15/AC.1/19 and Add.1-3) at its 8th meeting, on 20 June.

Working Group III held 12 meetings between 7 and 17 June 1988, and the Committee of the Whole took note of its report (A/S-15/AC.1/20/Corr.1) at its 8th meeting, on 20 June. On that day the Chairman of Working Group III also submitted a report (A/S-15/AC.1/21).
The final point under this chapter is that — again at the 8th meeting, on 20 June — Ambassador García Robles reported on the results of his consultations. This is to be found in the verbatim record (A/S-15/AC.1/PV.8).

Part III of the Rapporteur's report, which is chapter III, contains a list of non-governmental organizations and Peace and Disarmament Research Institutes which appeared before the Committee of the Whole.

Finally, the following sentence should be added as paragraph 28 of the draft report:

"At its 10th meeting, held on 25 June, the Committee of the Whole adopted its report, as contained in document A/S-15/AC.1/L.1 (Part I)/Corr.1, and (Part III)."

I should like to put on record that all delegations worked with determination, both at official and informal meetings, and in the informal consultations. I wish also to put on record the dedication of the Secretariat staff, particularly the dedication of the staff of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, and for the assistance given to my personal efforts. I wish to thank Mr. Kheradi and Mr. Gerardi-Siebert in particular.

The CHAIRMAN: I now invite the Committee to consider the draft report. Perhaps we can do so section by section, if members agree.

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): As you yourself pointed out, Mr. Chairman, the draft report is factual, and my delegation sees nothing given by the Rapporteur that is incorrect. In those circumstances, I propose that we dispense with the usual formalities and adopt the draft report as presented to us.

Mr. GHAREKHANI (India): I fully support the proposal of the representative of Cameroon, but I wish to make one suggestion. Numerous proposals have been presented during this session by numerous delegations. I should not like them to be lost to posterity. There should be some means of keeping them on
record. So I suggest that the Secretariat draft a paragraph—my delegation has
given the text of such a paragraph, but perhaps the Secretariat can draft its own
paragraph—and include that paragraph to say that a number of proposals were
received and that they are in the annex and form part of the official records of
the session.

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

Mr. PRANDLER (Secretary of the Committee of the Whole): You will recall,
Mr. Chairman, that your informal paper contained a paragraph—paragraph 65—with
similar language to that proposed by the representative of India. The draft is, of
course, in a way not our property, but the proposal made by the representative of
India could be processed by the Secretariat. At the same time, the Secretariat
would need clear guidance from the Committee of the Whole as to which documents
should be included, apart from those which are already listed in the draft report.

Therefore, since a number of informal conference room papers have been
submitted, it would give the Secretariat clear guidance if the Committee would
decide that those papers should still be listed—apart from the documents of the
session and the Committee of the Whole documents, those documents which have been
introduced in the Working Groups as working papers. That would give us the
necessary guidance; otherwise, it would be rather difficult for the Secretariat to
determine the scope of the papers to be listed.

Mr. KAPAMBWE (Zambia): I wish first to express my delegation's
appreciation to the Rapporteur for his excellent report. However, the Rapporteur
ended by referring to certain amendments that he has made to the report, and I
should like the last sentence that he suggested to include the fact that the
Committee of the Whole adopted the report with corrigenda 1 and 2, on the
understanding that the amendments suggested by the Rapporteur would be reproduced
as corrigendum 2.
Mr. DROUSHIOTIS (Cyprus): I support the proposal made by the representative of India. As I understand it from the statement made by the Secretary of the Committee, that would include all the proposals made to the special session.

Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic also wishes to express its gratitude to and appreciation of the Rapporteur, who did excellent work, for which everyone is grateful. However, I have a question relating to the listing of documents. Would it be possible to give a brief indication of the subjects of the documents listed? We believe that the document would be more informative if we added a brief indication of the subjects of the documents.

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

Mr. PRANDLER (Secretary of the Committee of the Whole): Members of the Committee of the Whole may recall that on an earlier occasion when the question of the proposals came up and was discussed I pointed out that the proposals made should be indicated by their titles, as delegations requested. Since it is sometimes rather difficult to determine what is the exact title of a given proposal, as I believe was also the case during the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, delegations have indicated to the Secretariat what short title they preferred for the documents concerned.
Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba), Rapporteur (interpretation from Spanish):

Regarding the comment of the representative of Zambia, he is quite right. Because of the speed of events, the new documents I mentioned a moment ago, which the report is to contain, will be incorporated once the Secretariat has established which of them are definitive. They will, of course, not be ready for the plenary meeting to take place in a few moments.

With regard to the remarks of the German Democratic Republic, we have simply followed the practice used at the first and second special sessions devoted to disarmament, which was to list the documents as we have.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we now proceed to adopt the report? If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I adjourn the meeting, may I express my gratitude and appreciation to all delegations, which have had to work long hours during the last week of the special session. I am deeply grateful for the unfailing courtesy and co-operation that has ungrudgingly been extended to me. I thank all my colleagues very much.

I also thank the conference servicing staff, who have also had to work long hours: the interpreters, the translators and the entire team of Secretariat staff. Above all, I sincerely thank the Under-Secretary-General of the Department for Disarmament Affairs and his able team. I know personally that they have worked all day for the last several days; each one of us owes them deep gratitude.

It is a matter of regret that we have not been able to achieve the goal we had set ourselves, but we all believe special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament are not one-time affairs. This was the third; I am sure there will
be a fourth. This is a process. We may not have succeeded on this occasion, but I personally have no doubt that we will succeed because we have no option but to succeed.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, we have come to the end of the fourth week of our work under your guidance at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It is very early in the morning - it is almost 4 a.m., and it is Sunday - which is the best proof of the seriousness with which all delegations have assumed the obligations incumbent upon them. Even if it has not been possible for the Assembly to conclude its work by adopting a document, as it did at the two earlier special sessions on disarmament, in 1978 and 1982, these deliberations will leave a lasting impression because of the many high-level statements that have been made at plenary meetings, including those of the President of Mexico, Mr. Miguel de la Madrid, which are reflected in the verbatim records of our meetings, and the many documents that have been submitted to the Assembly.

In conclusion I should like on behalf of my delegation warmly to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the manner in which you have conducted our debates. Our thanks go also to the Under-Secretary-General of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, to the staff that have serviced our meetings, to the Rapporteur and to the staff, seen or unseen, of the United Nations Secretariat.

Mr. Chairman, I share your opinion that even if we have not succeeded in adopting a final document, the session must not be considered a failure. What has been said here, and what I hope will be reality tomorrow, is that the Assembly has been obliged to leave until a later date the continuance of work in this regard. I do hope that that work will be completed in 1989 or 1990. I know we all hope that that will be the case.
In the meantime, when you adjourn this meeting, Mr. Chairman, you can be sure that, whether as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole or in some other capacity, in the exercise of other duties or responsibilities, we shall always be grateful to you. As you adjourn the meeting, you can be certain of the very high esteem in which the Mexican delegation holds you.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I adjourn the meeting, may I express my very special thanks to my colleagues the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur, with whom I have worked in very close harmony and on a most co-operative basis for over a year.

The meeting rose at 5 a.m., Sunday, 26 June 1988.