

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): My understanding is that what Ambassador Ledogar has read out on the basis of what I myself had put forward reads roughly as follows: "At the same plenary session, the Conference on Disarmament adopted the report of the Ad Hoc Committee containing the draft convention" (we can use any formulation there) "and agreed to transmit it to the General Assembly of the United Nations". My delegation will be happy to go along with that formulation.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): If so, we are probably moving towards a solution.

Mr. CALDERON (Peru) (translated from Spanish): I am sorry to contradict you, Sir, but that doesn't seem to me to be a solution. First of all, why ignore the majority position in this multilateral negotiating forum in favour of the draft convention? If consensus is what we are seeking, then let us make an effort to ensure that this majority position is reflected in the final paragraph. What we cannot do is end by sending an unduly lukewarm message with practically no signal to the General Assembly of the United Nations, because this text is going to be read not only by delegates in the United Nations but also by the entire international community - hence the major responsibility we bear to ensure that we send a signal concerning the majority position among the delegations accredited here. So that in that regard, in the first place, as you have said, Sir, there is no point in repeating what we have already said in paragraph 73. In paragraph 73 we have already spoken of the fact that the Conference has adopted the report. What is the point of saying it again? Where is the concession? I would like to see the concession made by the delegations which have difficulties in reaching consensus. And in the second place, referring to the transmittal to the General Assembly: pour quoi faire? What has been suggested is totally tasteless, colourless and insipid. So that this is not a reflection of the aspiration of the majority of the delegations represented here. So that if there are difficulties in finding a formula, then perhaps a short break may be more advisable: a temporary suspension of the meeting in case inspiration strikes us in the corridors. At all events, if we continue in plenary, my delegation does not agree with this wording.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria): I have very little to add to the views already expressed by my delegation. Perhaps if it will be helpful the Peruvian suggestion could be slightly modified. If you don't mind, Mr. President, I'll read out the suggestion. We could use this formulation: "Different positions were expressed. None the less hope was widely expressed that the draft convention" - and then continue with the sentence. But this is the minimum that my delegation will accept.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): I must say I continue to believe that the wise suggestion of Dr. Calderón is the one on which we ought to concentrate, and I agree with Ambassador Azikiwe about this. I had another variant of it to see if it helped, which was to add to Dr. Calderón's phrase, which I will read out again for the sake of clarity: "Despite the positions expressed by some