

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I take note of that proposal, because the discussion is going to cover texts we have not got in front of us and that is not always the easiest thing to do. I give the floor to the representative of the United States.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): No, we could not accept anything like the alternative that Ambassador Kamal proposes. We, at a minimum, would like to see this section reflect accurately the true situation that obtains here in this room. Indeed, right now. Now it's true as Ambassador Kamal pointed out that historically this sentence in previous reports to the General Assembly of previous treaties - treaty texts - was preceded by comments about whether or not there was consensus. Again I go back to the notes on the 1970 seabed Treaty. It began: "Delegations expressed satisfaction with the general consensus achieved and the spirit of compromise which resulted in the inclusion in that draft of amendments responsive to their suggestions", and then it went on: "Hope was widely expressed that the draft treaty would" and so forth. And in 1971 on BWC: "Delegations expressed satisfaction with the general consensus achieved and with the process of negotiation and the spirit of accommodation which resulted in the inclusion" and so forth. "A number of delegations pointed out that final decisions of their Governments would be taken at a later stage". I think if we could replicate that kind of approach it would be historically consistent and perhaps would more broadly, more accurately express the sentiments in this room on our endeavour.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I understand Ambassador Ledogar's concern to present the United Nations in New York with a text containing an encouraging note and I must say that personally I would prefer that, because I will have the honour to present the Conference's report to the First Committee. I would prefer to be able to report our satisfaction and our hope to the august Assembly of the United Nations, but we have to satisfy everybody here. I give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. OMAR (Egypt) (translated from Arabic): On paragraph 74 or what is left of it I will be very brief. My delegation gives its full support to the amendment submitted by Mr. Kamal concerning the second phrase in paragraph 74 because we believe that a factual text not expressing a specific position should be sufficient. If we express specific positions then we will also have to mention the satisfaction and apprehensions expressed by other delegations concerning the draft convention.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): My Government's position on the draft convention on the elimination of chemical weapons is well known. We have been talking about minor drafting points for two hours; we now realise the good sense of the suggestion made by the distinguished representative of Pakistan that this kind of discussion should be pursued in an informal meeting. What has occupied us this afternoon is far from being of historical importance or worthy of appearing in the verbatim record of this plenary. We are now coming to the heart of this question, and the problem is: how do we go from here to the General Assembly of the United Nations with a draft convention in our hands? This is what is important. Various precedents