

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Mr Robertson is certainly right on that point. I take paragraph 119:

(continued in English)

"The annual report to the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, as adopted by the Conference on 3 September 1992, is transmitted by the President on behalf of the Conference on Disarmament."

(continued in French)

It seems to me that Mr. Robertson is in complete agreement with Ambassador Kamal, who suggested a sentence saying: "It was agreed that the draft convention should be transmitted to the General Assembly for consideration." That would more or less coincide with paragraph 119. I give the floor to the representative of the United States.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): I join you, Mr. President, in agreeing that I hope we can avoid expressions of exasperation. The facts over the last months and weeks and days I think speak for themselves. Everyone in this room knows how many delegations give support to the convention, and even we know precisely how many have warm support, lukewarm support, cold support, begrudging support, barely-make-it support, but the sum total of all of that support is a very substantial proportion of the membership of this Conference. We also all know how many delegations are not in a position at this time, unfortunately, to give support to the convention. Now what we're seeking for, all of us I think, is an accurate reflection of the reality. And if the proposal is that we have a sentence which simply says to New York: "Dear General Assembly, we didn't make it. We're transferring our problems to you for consideration. Here is a list of our disappointments, and these are the unsatisfied wishes. Please make with it what you will", that's not an accurate reflection of the feeling in this room. It's not a question of the majority trying to impose a view on the small minority who unfortunately at this time are unable to give support to the convention. What we're seeking is an accurate reflection, and I think New York deserves it, and I think the public deserves it. This will, I hope, by the end of the evening become a public document, and it ought to be known what the accurate circumstance is. So it's not simply a question of - here we say with no judgement whatsoever, "We're sending our problem to New York. Thank you very much. Please help us out", which is what the Kamal statement sounds to me as though we're trying to do. I think what we ought to do is maybe combine these two thoughts. And as was pointed out, if we want an accurate reflection, then maybe paragraph 74 should read something along the following lines: "While consensus on the draft convention unfortunately could not be reached, hope was expressed that the draft convention would be commended by the General Assembly and opened for signature at an early date". That, I think, is the kind of statement that reflects. And as our Canadian colleague pointed out, we don't need to say here that we're transferring it; that's done by the whole report itself.