

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

reads as follows:" - and we reproduce pages 1 to 41 and we carry on: "The appendix to the report is attached as appendix I to this report". That would meet the point which had been raised by me.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The difficulty I see is that this latter wording mentions the main body of the report which the Conference adopts but skirts round the essential outcome of our work, that is to say, the appendix and the text of the convention. I think the proposal made by Ambassador Batsanov is clearer. It at least had the merit of covering the report and its appendix. I see that Ambassador Tóth is of the same opinion. Ambassador Hyltenius had asked for the floor.

Mr. HYLTEINIUS (Sweden): Perhaps we could get around that difficulty if we had in Ambassador Kamal's formulation in the last sentence: "The appendix to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, containing a draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction, which also constitutes an integral part of this report, is attached as appendix I". That would give them equal status and it would also make it clear what is in the appendix - I think that might be also a way out because in the following sentence we refer to the draft convention and there is no mention so far in the paragraph about the draft convention. So I suggest that with such wording we might cover these aspects.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank Ambassador Hyltenius for his contribution. However, I still believe that the proposal made by Ambassador Batsanov has the merit of bringing together most of the views that have been expressed so far. My sole concern is that we should not get bogged down in a procedural discussion. You all know as well as I do that when procedural arguments are involved in a trial, it is because the cause itself is a sick cause. I don't think that our convention on chemical weapons deserves such treatment. I give the floor to the representative of Italy.

Mr. FRANCESE (Italy): We believe that there is something positive in the Swedish proposal, and we should also bear in mind that sometimes a simple solution is the best. It strikes my delegation that the designation of the convention as such does not appear in these three paragraphs devoted to its adoption, and thus we would suggest a solution which may encompass both the legal point made earlier by Ambassador Kamal and all the positive elements that other colleagues here have announced - all while respecting the present structure of these three paragraphs. If you will allow me, Mr. President, I will give you my reading of a possible solution, which is as follows:

"73. At its ... plenary meeting, on ... 1992, the Conference adopted the report of the Ad Hoc Committee re-established by the Conference under the agenda item at its 606th plenary meeting (see paragraph 8 above) and the draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction appended to it."

And the rest stays as it is.