

Mr. BERASATEGUI (Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations) (translated from Spanish): Absolutely, Sir. The statement that was made by the distinguished representative of Argentina clarifies the matter in the same way as the representative of Algeria did earlier. Here we are talking about paragraph 73 of the report of the Committee only - not the appendix, and so the appendix will appear in the text of the annual report of the Conference to the General Assembly as appendix I.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): I continue to be confused. Paragraph 73 says that CD/1170 is an integral part of paragraph 73. Document CD/1170 is a document in 193 pages - it cannot be divided into two parts called first part and second part - it is one document; CD/1170 is one single integrated document of 193 pages and if we adopt the wording as it is in paragraph 73, then the whole of that report is then going to be a part of paragraph 73. I do not see what is the meaning of the word "first part" because the word does not exist in CD/1170 at all - if you take CD/1170 it says "Report" which starts from page 1 and it goes to page 193, so how are we going to adopt paragraph 73 as it is and still leave out, as we are told by the Secretary-General, the appendix of CD/1170 which is a part of CD/1170?

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Ambassador Kamal is right to talk about confusion, because the simpler things seem to me, the more complicated they become. That reminds me of what was written by the Swedish Statesman Axel Oxenstierna in 1648 on the occasion of the conclusion of the Treaty of Westphalia, which he described as confusio divinitus conservata. We are all contributing to this confusion, which I would like to see dispelled as soon as possible. I hope that what Ambassador Ledogar is going to say will help us to do so.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): Perhaps the confusion - if there is any real confusion - is caused by the fact that some may have a different document than I have. If I turn to page 41 of CD/1170, which is the end, that is, "Conclusions and recommendations", and then I come back to page 1 - maybe Ambassador Kamal's version is different but mine is not a single integrated document of 193 pages - it's two documents, the body in 41 pages and appendix in 193 pages for a total of 234 pages. Now, it seems to me the issue is simply whether at this point we interrupt with an insert of 41 pages or do we interrupt here with a two-centimetre-thick insert of 234 pages? I understand very clearly, as has been pointed out by our Argentinian colleague and the Secretary-General, that the purpose is not duplication - there will be no duplication - the purpose is simply to take the bulk of this document and put it at the end, which is, as I understand it, the way it has always been done in the past. So, I don't know what the confusion is - if it's real or if it's something else.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I would tend to agree with Mr. Ledogar. For some time now we've been trying to explain that reproducing the text of the convention once as an annex to the report published under the symbol CD/1170 and again as an annex to the report of the Conference on Disarmament seems to be a crazy waste, at which several delegates have in fact protested. I call to witness our colleague Mr. Felício, who has dwelt on this