

(B)

I really must apologize for presuming to speak for a third time. I hope that I will be forgiven by my fellow representatives. I should like to thank the Representative of Pakistan for very kindly allowing me his place in order that I might comment briefly on the revised Draft Resolution (DC/180/-REV 1) which the Representative of Ecuador has just introduced. I should also like to stress at once my warm appreciation of the constructive efforts which the representations of the six co-sponsors have made to meet the points contained in the Canadian amendment (DC/181).

During the past few days, the co-sponsors have been patiently working to find a text which would meet with the unanimous approval of this Commission, and I believe that their sincere efforts deserve the congratulations of all members.

The Commission has been given a helpful explanation by the Representative of Ecuador concerning the developments leading to the revision. I think that the revised text goes a long way to meet the reservation which prompted the Canadian Delegation in the first place to introduce its amendment. In particular, the new language in Operative Paragraph 2 of the revision recognizes the need for the earliest possible continuation of negotiations on disarmament. I suggest once again that this accurately reflects the views of the large majority of members of this Commission and responds to the expectations and hopes of peoples everywhere.

In the light of these changes in the text, and in the interests of obtaining the widest possible support for the recommendations of this Commission, I am prepared to accept the language of the revised draft resolution, although it will be realized that in several different respects it differs from the language of amendment.

However, I find that I am unable to agree with the co-sponsors on one point which has been central to Canada's position as I have expressed it. I refer to the order of Operative Paragraphs 1 and 2. Here may I say that the distinguished Representative of Ecuador has said that the order is of no importance. If he and the other co-sponsors feel that way about it, surely they would not object to having it changed. We do feel very deeply about it, and I suggest that he go the one step further and change this order of precedence, as he admits that it will not hurt his feelings very much if this is done.

I have already stressed in this Commission my conviction that the pace of arms development, with the international tension and anxiety that it creates, makes it imperative that the Commission give the greatest emphasis to the need for disarmament negotiations at the earliest possible time. And that, I suggest, is the reason we are here; this is the business that we have come here to do, all of us. For this reason, I hold to the view which I expressed this morning, that the order of the operative paragraphs should be such as to give first priority to the one recommending early negotiations. This order of priority is entirely a question of emphasis and