

UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

UNITED NATIONS  
CENTRE FOR DISARMAMENT  
DEPARTMENT OF  
POLITICAL AND SECURITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS  
Reference Library Distr.  
GENERAL



A/CN.10/PV.35  
4 June 1980

ENGLISH

---

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 4 June 1980, at 11 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. VELLODI

(India)

Agenda item 4: (continued)

- (a) Consideration of various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, in order to expedite negotiations aimed at effective elimination of the danger of nuclear war
- (b) Consideration of the agenda items contained in section II of resolution 33/71 H, with the aim of elaborating, within the framework and in accordance with the priorities established at the tenth special session, a general approach to negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament

---

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 4 (continued)

- (a) CONSIDERATION OF VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE ARMS RACE, PARTICULARLY THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE AND NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT, IN ORDER TO EXPEDITE NEGOTIATIONS AIMED AT EFFECTIVE ELIMINATION OF THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR
- (b) CONSIDERATION OF THE AGENDA ITEMS CONTAINED IN SECTION II OF RESOLUTION 33/71 H, WITH THE AIM OF ELABORATING, WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRIORITIES ESTABLISHED AT THE TENTH SPECIAL SESSION, A GENERAL APPROACH TO NEGOTIATIONS ON NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL DISARMAMENT

The CHAIRMAN: You will all recall that when the Commission met last, we had agreed on the procedure to be adopted in regard to the consideration of items 3, 4 and 5 on our agenda. According to that procedure, the Working Group on agenda item 3, relating to the Second Disarmament Decade, has been very actively considering this agenda item, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Adeniji, in an effort to produce an agreed text that could be incorporated in our report to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. We had hoped that the work on agenda item 3 in the Working Group could be completed by last Friday. Unfortunately, and in spite of the determined efforts of Ambassador Adeniji, it has not been possible, because of the understandable complexity of the issues involved, to complete the work of the Working Group as we had anticipated. They are still continuing; they are, in fact, meeting now in Conference Room 11.

Thus, I see some difficulty in beginning a formal plenary meeting without adequate participation by delegations. It is my intention at this meeting, therefore, to introduce the revised working paper on agenda item 4 (A/CN.10/CRP.8/Rev.1) and thereafter, if any delegations wish to comment or seek clarifications, they will naturally be permitted to do so. But the further consideration of agenda item 4 will commence at this afternoon's meeting.

(The Chairman)

As far as agenda item 5 is concerned, you will recall that we had agreed, after the formal exchange here in the Commission, that further consideration of that item should be undertaken in informal meetings of the Commission under the chairmanship of Mr. Sucharipa of Austria. Such meetings have been very actively pursued during the last week or 10 days, and it is my understanding that the work of that group will be completed this morning. Thus, we can expect a report from Mr. Sucharipa at our plenary meeting this afternoon.

Having said this, and before turning to agenda item 4 and the revised working paper, let me also say that it is my intention to try to finish the substantive consideration of agenda items 3, 4 and 5 by tomorrow evening. Tomorrow is already Thursday, and thereafter we have one day, Friday, in which to complete our work for this session. It was my hope, and it still is, that we can leave Friday morning free for the Secretariat to put all the papers together, and also in order to permit delegations to work on the statements some of them may wish to make before we adjourn on Friday afternoon. I hope that we can still stick to that schedule, that is, not to meet on Friday morning, but to have our concluding meeting on Friday afternoon, at which time we will, I hope, adopt the report and listen to statements from representatives who wish to speak in the plenary meeting before concluding the session. If this schedule is to be observed - and it is a tight schedule - it is important that we should use all the time we have between now and tomorrow evening. It would therefore be unavoidable to hold a night meeting tonight and possibly another night meeting tomorrow.

(The Chairman)

I should like to have avoided it, because I realized that it would cause inconvenience to delegations and to the Secretariat, but as things stand now I see no way.

I hope also that we shall be able to complete consideration of items 4 and 5 today. Thus tomorrow we shall commence consideration of item 3 on the basis of the report of the Working Group that will be available by then. We shall also perhaps resolve certain other points relating to our report on other items of the agenda.

Representatives will have seen the draft report in document A/CN.10/CRP.9 that has been made available by the Secretariat and by the Rapporteur who has expressed regret that he will be unable to be present today. If any representatives wish to comment on that draft report they may do so at any time. This draft is only a skeleton and we shall not obtain a clear picture of the report until we know what matters will arise on items 3, 4 and 5.

May I now explain some of the points I wish to stress regarding the revision of my paper on item 4 of the agenda. That document has been distributed this morning in document A/CN.10/CRP.8/Rev.1. In making my comments, I shall refer to observations made during the informal meeting of the Commission yesterday morning by several delegations.

No change has been made to paragraph 1, because there were no observations on that paragraph.

There were several observations on paragraph 2 and the suggestion was made by some delegations that, in view of the fact that serious consideration had been given to the general question of the international situation in the context of the document on the disarmament decade, it would perhaps be better to use the language that had been agreed upon by the Drafting Group on item 3. In response to that suggestion, I tried to obtain from the Secretariat the text agreed to on item 3 in regard to the international situation and I was told that it was the text contained in paragraph 4 of the working paper at present under consideration by the group on item 3.

(The Chairman)

The last four sentences beginning in the sixth line of paragraph 2 with the words "International peace and security ..." down to the end of the paragraph, are identical to the language used in the paragraph that I understand has been agreed to without any difficulty by the working group.

There were no observations or suggestions made in regard to paragraph 3 during our meeting yesterday morning, so the wording has been left as it was.

Several observations were made on paragraph 4. There was some doubt about the phrase "profound dismay" and I have tried to change that. An important point was made by several delegations that the Commission can only make recommendations to the General Assembly and it is for the General Assembly to take whatever action it wishes on the basis of those recommendations. Therefore, in the third sentence of that paragraph I have said that the Commission "recommends" to the General Assembly certain action.

A suggestion was made on the resumption of talks that had been interrupted. Although there was no discussion on that, I have put it in because at least one delegation supported the proposal yesterday morning.

As I explained yesterday, in paragraph 4 I have referred to measures for the implementation of the Programme of Action enumerated in the Final Document and, more specifically, measures in connexion with the Second Disarmament Decade. I did that in an effort not to repeat or to be selective in the reference to specific measures.

There was a fairly lengthy discussion yesterday morning on paragraph 5 and the representative of France and some other delegations had difficulty with the reference to the Charter of the United Nations in the form in which it appeared in the earlier paper (A/CN.10/CRP.8). The suggestion was made by several delegations that the difficulty indicated by the representative of France and others could be overcome if reference were made both to the purposes and principles of the Charter and to other relevant and generally accepted principles of international law. I have therefore incorporated that proposal.

(The Chairman)

Objections were raised to the last part of paragraph 5 of my earlier paper, referring to the withdrawal of great-Power military presence from regions of crises and tension. It was pointed out by at least two delegations that at times that presence is part of collective defence arrangements. Therefore, I have tried to meet that concern by introducing a preamble to the sentence, as follows:

"While bearing in mind the inherent right of States to individual and collective self-defence in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations ..." (A/CN.10/CRP.8/Rev.1, para. 5)

No comments were made on paragraph 6. In paragraph 7, it was pointed out that it would not be correct to say that "the Commission reaffirmed that nuclear disarmament is the task of the first and highest priority" because, according to at least one delegation, the Commission had not said any such thing earlier. Therefore I have used the language of paragraph 20 of the Final Document and I have said that

"The Commission recalled that the Special Session had declared that among all disarmament measures, effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war have the highest priority". (Ibid., para. 7)

It will be recalled that the second part of paragraph 7 has been taken from paragraph 48 of the Final Document. I have tried to change the language so that it is an accurate reflection of the Final Document.

(The Chairman)

In paragraph 8 there were no serious difficulties with the first part, about the Committee on Disarmament. I think that some representatives will have noted that I have said that the Committee on Disarmament "should fully discharge its responsibilities". However, on my earlier text of paragraph 8 there were reservations raised regarding the last two sentences, and I have therefore tried to meet the difficulties expressed yesterday by condensing it a little and changing the language and, more specifically, relating the recommendations to the nuclear disarmament measures to be included in the Declaration of the Second Disarmament Decade.

As to paragraph 9, I do not believe that there were any serious objections regarding the first part. However, there were a number of reservations on the last sentence in the last part, particularly the reference to progress in conventional disarmament measures between the two major alliance systems.

Here again, I had tried to meet the difficulties but at the same time keeping one point regarding the situation in Europe which as I think all members realize, is specifically mentioned in paragraph 82 of the Final Document. I have, however, changed the phrase "between the two major alliance systems" to "particularly between the two major alliance systems" - saying, in other words, that there is responsibility on the part of all States as far as conventional disarmament is concerned, but that in this particular case we are talking about the importance of agreements reached in Europe which, as is stated in paragraph 82 of the Final Document, will contribute to the strengthening of security in Europe and constitute a significant step towards enhancing international peace and security.

In paragraph 10 I have tried to make some changes, again to accommodate observations made by the representative of France. The first sentence in the new version of this paragraph is almost a literal repetition of a part of paragraph 83 of the Final Document, and the second part is drawn from the wording of a section of paragraph 85.

(The Chairman)

When we come to paragraph 11, I think that most representatives will have observed that I have made one change. It was inevitable because certain delegations expressed objection to the study. It was my earlier understanding that perhaps there was some general perception, but in view of the statements made yesterday objecting to the study I have had to change it to say that "The discussions in the Commission showed that there was wide support in favour of making a recommendation to the General Assembly". In my opinion, this is a factual reflexion of the situation.

These are the observations which I should like to make now. Remembering that this is a plenary meeting, if delegations are prepared to make comments at this stage, I should of course be very happy to hear them. If, however, they feel that the substantive discussion should commence this afternoon when - although I cannot say so for certain - there may be more delegations present here, I shall of course be prepared to adjourn this meeting.

Accordingly, I would ask delegations if they have had opportunity to study the paper and discuss it among themselves and are now in a position to make comments. I would only appeal to delegations to remember that we have to complete item 4 today, if necessary at the night meeting.

Mr. IIAM (Kuwait): In the earlier version of paragraph 11 there was mention of a general perception that had emerged in favour of recommending to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly a study on all aspects of the conventional arms race. It will be recalled that during the informal meeting yesterday several delegations, including my own, strongly objected to recommending such a study. My delegation insisted that it was necessary to reach a consensus on the general approach to be followed by the study, its structure and its scope, here in this Commission before making a recommendation to the General Assembly .



(Mr. Imam, Kuwait)

In the new version of paragraph 11 now before us I notice that the main change is simply the deletion of the words "a general perception" and their replacement by the phrase, "wide support," which seems to make the recommendation for such a study even stronger. I wish to seek some clarification because what the Chairman has just said implies that this is simply a statement of fact. Does the statement of fact mean that we are making a recommendation to the General Assembly on the basis of wide support, or does it simply mean that no recommendation is being made to the General Assembly?

The CHAIRMAN: In answer to the point raised by the representative of Kuwait, I may say that the distinction between the earlier version and the present one lies in the fact that I had put in the phrase "general perception" following the language suggested by the representative of Nigeria.

In my opinion, the statement in the earlier version that a general perception had emerged would have implied a consensus. In the new version when we talk of wide support it means that a very large number of delegations had supported this, but it does imply that there was no consensus and that objections were raised. How we interpret this in terms of making a recommendation is for the General Assembly to decide.

In any case, it is for the General Assembly to decide how to proceed with this matter. If this is acceptable, the Assembly can only take note of the fact that there was a proposal that the study should be recommended and that that proposal had wide support in the Commission.

Mr. PALENYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It seems to me, Sir, that you have gone to a great deal of effort in order to give us the report on item 4 of the agenda and to make it more acceptable to us, but as regards paragraph 11 I am forced to agree with the representative of Kuwait, and I should like to add the following.

(Mr. Palenykh, USSR)

The comparison of the earlier version of paragraph 11 with this present version shows that in essence there is no great difference between them. In the first version there was the phrase, "general perception," and in the newer one there is the phrase, "wide support," but even in its present form paragraph 11 reflects the discussion which took place here in a rather one-sided way, in that views were expressed in support of the proposal to carry out research on conventional weapons and some delegations objected quite strongly to such research.

(Mr. Palenykh, USSR)

Thus, if we have paragraph 11 saying that "there was wide support", then it should also say that there were in addition strong objections to carrying out such research. In that form, this paragraph would reflect more accurately what took place here. We cannot agree with so one-sided a formulation as "wide support"; that formulation does not reflect a consensus solution to this question, because there was no consensus on it.

With regard to paragraph 9, which talks about "the two major alliances systems", could not this language be made closer to that used in the Final Document of the tenth special General Assembly session? At the moment I cannot propose a formulation, but perhaps something could be taken from the Final Document of the tenth special session. In this way we would satisfy the objections expressed by some delegations on the substance of this question: that not only the major military systems possess significant conventional armaments, but that a whole range of countries not belonging to military organizations also have a large number of conventional weapons. And it is not necessary to look for examples. We have all seen a very clear example that confirms that argument.

Mr. HEISBOURG (France)(interpretation from French): We should like first of all, Mr. Chairman, to thank you for the effort you have made since yesterday to put before the Commission a document which to a great extent takes into account the comments made by various delegations during our debates, particularly as regards the problems we might face from the legal point of view. I note that the language of the paper essentially meets any problems that we might have had.

I should like to make a small comment on paragraph 5, where the text reads,

"...generally accepted principles of international law relating to the maintenance of international peace and security, especially those regarding the respect for the sovereignty...".

We would like the word "especially" replaced by the words "inter alia" for the very simple reason that we think that those principles all have equal significance; that none are more important than any others in international law.

We still have some problems with the items on disarmament. First of all, the end of paragraph 5, referring to the dismantling of foreign military

bases, foreign military presence and so forth, does not yet meet the comments which were made in this forum last year as well as this year. Last year we were not able to agree on such a formulation, and I do not think that matters are any different this year. It might be timely to find a formulation which takes the situation into account.

My second comment is on paragraph 8. We do not think that the present wording fully reflects reality as regards the task before the Committee on Disarmament. As far as I know, the Committee has not yet received a mandate

"...to undertake substantial negotiations, with the participation of all nuclear weapon States, on the cessation of the nuclear arms race...". Paragraph 50 of the Final Document does not expressly entrust the Committee with such a mandate. So in this passage the wording should be modified to take this fact into account.

Finally, paragraph 8 requests the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session to "initiate action to prevent the further spiralling of the nuclear arms race...". We have some problems with the expression "initiate action" for the simple reason that these measures will be spread out over a decade, the paragraph to which we refer will be found, if I am not mistaken, in the part of our report relating to the Decade. So wording such as "favour action to prevent the further spiralling ..." would perhaps correspond more accurately to the real possibilities which may arise later this year.

Finally, but reserving the right to make further comments during the debate, we think that the formulation used in paragraph 11 reflects very precisely the facts as they are within our Commission, namely that there was "wide support in favour of recommending to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly that it approve, in principle," and so on.

Mr. WILKINSON (United States of America): First of all, Mr. Chairman, we should like to compliment you on what is, in our view, a considerable improvement on the text that you had circulated among us yesterday and on a conscientious effort to come much closer to a basis for a document on which we can all agree.

In particular, I think that your decision to incorporate into paragraph 2 language that was substantially agreed upon in Drafting Group 3 was a clever way of dealing with the problem which we confronted.

I should like to make some initial comments on a few other formulations in the Chairman's paper, and to reserve the right to come back to one or two others, perhaps later in the day when I have had the chance to have further conversations with my capital. With regard to paragraph 4, we noted that yesterday the representative of the United Kingdom said he thought the first sentence was somewhat gloomy. We note that, despite the substitution of the word "regret" for the word "dismay", the text remains as it was, and we may have some further textual suggestions on this.

The third sentence in paragraph 4 inserts a suggestion made yesterday by the representative of the Soviet Union which, in our view, is somewhat gratuitous in light of the fact that the general programme of measures which were to be undertaken and which are agreed in the Final Document does cover the specific talks which have been under way since then, some of which have been, as is noted, suspended. In our view the same idea would be expressed without the addition made yesterday, and we would strongly prefer to have the text remain as it was.

With regard to paragraph 5, the representative of France has already made the comment that the inclusion of the phrase "including withdrawal of foreign military forces and dismantling of foreign military bases" which appears in the last sentence of paragraph 5 would be unacceptable to my delegation and to many others. Even with the suppression of that clause, we will have to consider very carefully whether this sentence would be acceptable; I may have further comments on that, if the suppression of that clause proves to be generally acceptable.

(Mr. Wilkinson, United States)

On paragraph 8, I should like to agree with and support the general observations made by the representative of France. We share the concern that the French representative has expressed in relation to the first sentence. We should like to consider further the acceptability of the second sentence with the possible substitution of the word "favour" or some similar word for "initiate".

As far as paragraph 9 is concerned, in the second sentence, we would respectfully ask Members of the Commission through you, Mr. Chairman, whether the sentence would not be better balanced in the interests of all concerned if the word "the" before "major responsibility" were changed to "a", since we believe that it is not just the two major alliance groups which should be involved in the further discussion of conventional arms limitations and negotiations, but rather all the members of this Commission.

If I may refer to paragraph 11, we would support the view of the representative of France in saying that we feel that this is a realistic appreciation of the situation and we hope that this text will prove generally acceptable to all represented here.

Those are some preliminary remarks on the text that we have before us and we may have one or two more remarks to make this afternoon.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): Some of the points that I had intended to make have actually already been made, so that I will be able to confine myself to two particular paragraphs: that is, paragraphs 4 and 11.

I did comment that we thought some changes should be made in paragraph 4 and although I am very grateful for the changes which the Chairman has made, I do not feel that they quite represent even now the actual position, particularly on the question of the suspension or the impasse which has been reached in limited disarmament and limited arms control measures.

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

For instance, I happen to know that in Geneva we still have very active ongoing talks on a comprehensive test ban and on chemical weapons. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would propose, if you would allow me, that I produce a slightly revised version of the first sentence of paragraph 4, which I hope to give to you this afternoon.

On paragraph 11, I should just like to say that my delegation agrees with the formulation which you have produced for this paragraph. We believe it is true to say that there was wide support voiced in this Commission in favour of recommending that the principles of the study on conventional disarmament should be undertaken. So I should like to see that paragraph retained as it is.

Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Like the representatives who spoke before me, I should also like to note that in a comparatively short time a good deal of work has been done. Mr. Chairman, as you yourself, in presenting this document to us, have said, the relevant changes cover a whole series of paragraphs of the draft document now under discussion. But since this revised document was issued only this morning, that is, only a short time ago, we naturally need a certain amount of time to devote more attention to these formulations and these alterations, both great and small, which you have carried out. Naturally, therefore, in making our comments and in expressing our point of view now, we have it in mind, should the necessity arise, to return to these or other remarks at a later stage, and we should like it understood that what we are saying now is by way of a preliminary approach to this document.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

First of all, I should like to say that, in our opinion, paragraph 4 of the document as it is at present formulated, taking into account those comments and considerations expressed at the last meeting - not least by our own delegation - fully and clearly reflects not only the discussions which have taken place, but also the factual state of affairs. In this sense, this paragraph seems to us an improvement on the form in which it was drafted before.

You yourself have said, Mr. Chairman, that in a number of cases, by introducing some words and some small refinements, you were attempting to provide a better reflection of the existing situation. But it seems to us that in paragraph 9, for instance, the introduction of the word "particularly" does not solve the problem which was being discussed yesterday by the representatives of the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union. Our delegation also drew particular attention to this point. In our view, this formulation is in need of further improvements in the search for a clearer reflection of the existing state of affairs.

Allow me now to say a few words about paragraph 11. If some of the representatives who have spoken before me consider that this paragraph in its present form is such as to satisfy everybody, then it is clear that there is some element of inexactitude here. Why? Because if we say that support existed, I shall not insist on the wording here which says: "...wide support in favour". The degree of measuring "wide support" is rather relative. Therefore, if in fact support was expressed for this proposal mentioned in paragraph 11, serious objections were also raised at the same time - I should say, many serious objections - to the substance of the question, and these were repeated once more today by the representative of Kuwait. In our view therefore, my delegation, in continuing to draw attention to the existing state of affairs, which does not very accurately reflect the foregoing discussion, and the reaction to this proposal contained in paragraph 1, considers all the same that, if we are trying to find a way out of the situation on the basis of formulations contained in paragraph 11, then it is of course necessary to say that serious objections existed in principle against such an approach.

Such are our preliminary remarks on this document.



Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): Mr. Chairman, I should like at the very outset to commend your efforts to bring us closer to a consensus document. I think you have been very successful in this.

My remarks can only be preliminary because I have just received the document and have not studied it thoroughly, but I should like to comment on several points which have already been raised in the discussion. First of all, concerning paragraph 4, I think that in its present form it is satisfactory to our delegation. The remark was made that the first sentence sounds very gloomy, but I should like to point out that the situation at this moment is very gloomy, and if we wish to be true to the facts we should reflect this situation.

I agree with the remarks of my colleague from the Byelorussian SSR concerning paragraph 9, and I should like also to associate myself with his remarks concerning paragraph 11.

Mr. Chairman, if your interpretation is true that the intention is to reflect the fact that there is no consensus on the proposal for a study, we should say so in the text and add something in order to avoid an incorrect interpretation. In other words, something to the effect that "On the other hand, there were strong objections raised to this idea" should be introduced into this paragraph in order to give a complete picture of the discussion.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): My comment is restricted to paragraph 11 of the document before us. My delegation has already expressed its reservations on the study proposed on conventional disarmament, which we feel will be yet one more study which leads us nowhere and adds further to the complicated problem, rather than solving it. But in particular my delegation would request that the reference in the second line of paragraph 11 to "the conventional arms race" be deleted, since I find that even the document submitted by the representative of Denmark, A/CN.10/13, specifies "conventional disarmament" rather than the arms race. In that case, the words "conventional arms race and on", I feel, may be quite aptly removed from paragraph 11, so that the first sentence would read:

"The Commission considered a proposal for a study on all aspects of disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces."

Mr. KAHN (German Democratic Republic): Mr. Chairman, my delegation would like to express its appreciation of your efforts in revising your paper. At this stage, studying the revised version, we shall limit our remarks to paragraph 11. Discussions in the Disarmament Commission have shown that there are two opposed positions, one approving a recommendation to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, and, on the other hand, a strong position in favour of promoting effective measures of conventional disarmament instead of carrying out a study. Therefore my delegation cannot but insist on a complete description of the situation relating to a study on conventional disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: As there are no further comments on this paper at the present stage, may I make this observation. It is clear that, while delegations have expressed satisfaction that the revised text is an improvement on the earlier one, several delegations continue to have reservations on one or another point. We shall therefore have to consider how best to continue with our work, it being understood that we have to complete at least the substantive consideration of this today - if necessary, as I have said, at an evening meeting. There are two ways of doing this. One is for the Chairman to prepare yet another revision. There are practical difficulties because of the time available, and also because even a third revision would still meet with reservations from delegations.

Some delegations have suggested specific amendments. The representative of the United Kingdom said that he would propose a formulation for the first sentence of paragraph 4. I would therefore suggest the following course of action.

The afternoon meeting would begin at 4 o'clock instead of 3 o'clock. In the meantime, if those delegations which have strong views on some of the wording of paragraph 4 would meet me, and if they have any specific language to suggest would give it to me in writing, I could then take their observations into account where there are serious objections, it being understood, of course, that a consensus document cannot satisfy everybody fully, as I hope members will bear in mind.

(The Chairman)

As I say, I should be quite prepared to have the beginning of the afternoon meeting postponed until 4 o'clock, at which time, on the basis of informal consultations I might have with some delegations, it might be possible for me to suggest further changes in the paper. But I sincerely hope that delegations will co-operate with me, as they have done so far, particularly by keeping in mind the short time available, and will try to live with the formulations in the paper - unless, of course, there are formulations which are totally unacceptable to them.

Unless there are any other observations on this paper at present, and unless I hear any objections, we shall adjourn consideration of it until 4 o'clock this afternoon, when I shall try to meet some of the additional reservations that have been expressed, to the extent that that is possible.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.