

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): With due respect to the Iranian delegation and Mr. Mashhadi, I think we could usefully use the time to solve the problem that we are currently discussing, and if there needs to be a suspension, that a suspension be granted to Iran and others who wish it, once we have everything ready to face the ultimate question. We have heard from our Pakistani colleague some comments on these paragraphs and obviously we are going to have to discuss them. With your permission, I would like to answer some of the observations on paragraphs 72, 73 and 74 that were made by Ambassador Kamal to see if we can't get this straightened out even as negotiations continue on the question. As I understand it has to do with distribution of executive council seats allocated to the Asian region. So, with your permission, I will continue, Mr. President.

First of all, with regard to the secretariat and first reading, I think the secretariat was absolutely right to produce a first draft along the lines that was produced. According to my records, in the sea-bed Treaty of September 1970, the predecessor body to this one, the CCD, wound up its concomitant or its analogous paragraph with precisely these words: "Hope was widely expressed that the draft treaty would be commended by the General Assembly and opened for signature at an early date." Similarly, in 1971, according to my notes, when the biological weapons Convention was under consideration, the identical sentence appeared in the concomitant paragraph: "Hope was widely expressed that the draft convention would be commended by the General Assembly and opened for signature at an early date." So it seems quite natural that in doing the first draft the secretariat would look to a precedent. The sentence was not, Ambassador Kamal, as I see it, lifted out of the CW Ad Hoc Committee report - rather it was lifted out of past history of this body and its linear predecessor organizations. Second, it does not say the same thing as the paragraph to which Ambassador Kamal referred - it does not quite say the same thing at all. As I read it, in paragraph 41 on page 40 of CD/1170, in which we say "most delegations ...", etc. etc., we are commending ourselves, that is, most of us are commending ourselves. It is true that we do go on to say that we are of the opinion that the draft convention should be transmitted to the General Assembly for commendation and opened for signature. What is said here is according to precedent of other treaties being forwarded to New York which unfortunately did not enjoy full consensus at the time they were transferred, which apparently is the case here. What most of us are saying here is that hope was widely expressed that the convention would be commended - it's quite different language. Now, do I understand that the Pakistani delegation would like to have the two sentences brought exactly into line so that they could be declared redundant? Well, that's not quite what I think ought to be done. If we do anything, I think we could make them crisply more different so that they could clearly be seen as different recommendations. There are various ways to do that, and I would be glad to suggest language if that should be the way you wish to go, Mr. President.

Mr. BATSANOV (Russian Federation) (translated from Russian): I too have a few questions on section D (Chemical weapons). The first question relates to paragraph 72. I think my question is a very technical question, and it is related to the following point. Paragraph 72 starts with the words "The list of new documents". If we look at the next section, "Prevention of an arms