

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thought that our Secretary-General's explanation was clear; it seems that that is not yet the case. I give the floor to Ambassador Kamal.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): I join Ambassador Batsanov in his confusion, which by now is being called "being well informed". The problem is that we are discussing three separate ideas together. Perhaps, I think, the best way would be to go down this part D paragraph by paragraph and, if you agree, perhaps we can start with paragraph 72. On paragraph 72 I agree with Ambassador Batsanov that one can word it better by saying "the documents presented during the 1992 session" in order to obviate any chance of misunderstandings later on. My suggestion at the moment is that we consider these three points paragraph by paragraph and not the section as a whole. If you agree, then I will, for the moment, restrict myself to having said what I have said on paragraph 72 only.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The delegations will no doubt remember that the whole discussion started when we were taking up section D (Chemical weapons). Delegations did not leave me the time to take it up paragraph by paragraph - objections were voiced on the manner of undertaking this examination, in an informal or formal meeting, even before we were able to do so. But I will willingly now proceed to examine it paragraph by paragraph, which as I understand it implies the agreement of the Conference to our proceeding in that way. In order to avoid any later confusion I suggest that we now take up paragraph 72, on the list of documents presented to the Conference. All these documents are listed in document CD/1170. I do not know whether they should all be listed here, if that is what Ambassador Batsanov has in mind, or whether it is simply that the wording of this paragraph should be exactly the same as, for example, in paragraph 75, which reads as follows:

"The list of documents presented to the Conference during its 1992 session under the agenda item is contained in the report submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee referred to in the following paragraph."

That is one way of looking at the matter, but there are two representatives who wish to speak on paragraph 72, first of all the representative of Hungary, Mr. Tóth, and then the representative of Algeria, Mr. Semichi.

Mr. TOTH (Hungary): For my delegation this is not a real problem, but if it poses some difficulties for others I think we should solve it in a way so as not to complicate the problem any further. If we add the notion of 1992, by that we exclude several documents from the list of documents which are dated 1991. So my suggestion would be a very very simple one and I would suggest to put it for adoption - to drop the word "new" and to say the "list of documents presented to the Conference."