forward in that paper. Naturally, Mr. Martin made it clear to the leader of the Soviet Delegation that, as we saw it, requesting the Disarmament Commission to "take into account" a particular document does not in any sense involve the co-sponsors' approval of all the contents of that document. If it did, the Canadian Delegation, and also our associates, would have been quite unable to agree to the inclusion in paragraph 2 of our draft resolution of a reference to the Soviet resolution, with certain parts of which we have

Had the key phrase in this operative paragraph been not "taking into account" but "on the basis of" the Canadian Delegation for one could not have agreed to include reference to the Soviet resolution, and we would have under-stood more easily the Soviet Delegation's inability to accept inclusion of a reference to the United States working paper. 48 18 1 10 10 1 N - Bride Holen & Co-

In any case, the Canadian Delegation, together with our associates, the delegations of France, United Kingdom and United States suggested as an alternative for this paragraph a text which would refer specifically to none of the main proposals which we wish the Disarmament Commission and its sub-committee to examine. We put forward ಲ್ಲೇ ಿಳಿ**ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ** ™ the following suggestion: .

· .

14 - 43 - 5 S.

1111

•....

ι. CALL SUM CAMPACLON "Requests the Disarmament Commission to seek an acceptable solution of the disarmament problem taking into account the various proposals referred to in the Preamble of this resolution and any other proposals within the Commission's and any other proposals within the Commission's terms of reference." I is the second to the

· .

ana da ta Costat

1143935

• On this basis, I am happy to say that the Soviet Delegation, after careful study, were able to agree a

j ta∄ j ः **स**् ? As will be readily seen, the effect of the new version is of course to refer back to the preamble, the third name much of which refer back to the preamble, the third paragraph of which refers both to the Soviet resolution which this Committee has been considering and to the fourth report of the Disarmament Commission of the July 29, 1954, and explicitly to the documents annexed thereto. Among these annexed documents are the Anglo-French proposals of June 11 and the United States working paper of May 25, 1954. All of these documents, therefore, are among those which the Disarmament Commission would now be requested , to take into account in its search for an acceptable solution of the disarmament problem. ી તેમને ગેલાક

That then, Mr. Chairman, represents a full and candid account of the revisions we have made, and the reasons for them. I have already expressed the satisfac-tion of the co-sponsors of the first version of this resolution that the Soviet Union has now agreed to join us in proposing this revised text for the sympathetic consideration of this Committee. I feel sure that all members of the Committee will share our satisfaction that on this question of procedure at least, the five members of what has come to be known as the London Sub-Committee have reached agreement.

I freely admit of course that reaching agreement among five countries even on the terms of a procedural resolution on a subject as vital as this, has been far from