

---

# Conference on Disarmament

31 August 2010

English

---

## Final record of the one thousand one hundred and ninety-fifth plenary meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Tuesday, 31 August 2010, at 10.15 a.m.

*President:* Mr. Fabien Marie Nkou .....(Cameroon)

**The President** (*spoke in French*): It is an honour for me to declare open the 1195th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament. Without further ado, I should like to give the floor to our guest of honour, His Excellency Mr. Henri Eyebe Ayissi, Minister of External Relations of the Republic of Cameroon. Excellency, you have the floor.

**Mr. Eyebe Ayissi** (Cameroon) (*spoke in French*): Thank you, Mr. President. Speaking in my capacity as Minister of External Relations of Cameroon, I should first like to discharge a most agreeable duty, that of conveying to you the warm regards of His Excellency Mr. Paul Biya, President of the Republic of Cameroon and head of the diplomatic service, who specifically sent me here to the Palais des Nations to illustrate and confirm his personal interest in the current session of the Conference on Disarmament and to express his fervent wish and desire to see your efforts, exchanges and discussions meet with success. I should also like to express Cameroon's immense gratitude to the distinguished States members of the Conference that you represent for the considerable trust you have placed in us by allowing Cameroon to chair the Conference as one of the six Presidents for 2010. I can assure you that my country will discharge the duties associated with the responsibilities conferred upon it to the best of its abilities and with the invaluable assistance of all States members of the Conference.

(*spoke in English*)

Speaking as Minister of External Relations of Cameroon and addressing such a distinguished audience on the occasion of Cameroon's presidency of the Conference on Disarmament, permit me on behalf of my delegation first of all to express our warm congratulations to the Conference, not only on its past achievement, but particularly on propagating universal awareness of the *problématique* of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

In the same vein, I would like to express my delegation's sincere gratitude and admiration for the genuine endeavours of the past Presidents of the Conference on Disarmament for 2010 to move the process forward slowly, surely, collaboratively and with mutual respect.

In this connection, I would like to pay homage to the remarkable efforts of Ambassador Mohammed Abdul Hannan of Bangladesh, Ambassador Mikhail Khvostov of Belarus, Ambassador Alex Van Meeuwen of Belgium, Ambassador Luiz Filipe de Macedo Soares of Brazil, Ambassador Gancho Ganev of Bulgaria, and Ambassador Idriss Jazaïry of Algeria, who in 2009 made it possible to adopt a programme of work.

(*spoke in French*)

Like other States members of the Conference, Cameroon fully adheres to the universal ideal of international disarmament. It subscribes to the vision of a secure world free from weapons of mass destruction. For this reason, it has chosen to make a determined contribution, in conjunction with the other nations of the world, to the formulation, promotion and adoption of the relevant international legal instruments. In this same spirit, it has acceded to all the multilateral legal instruments negotiated by the Conference on Disarmament, including the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), which taken together, constitute the solid, ethical "bedrock" that underpins international peace and security today.

For the same reason, and as you are aware, Cameroon has unreservedly subscribed to the goal of general and complete disarmament by acceding to the 1996 Pelindaba Treaty, which makes Africa a nuclear-weapon-free zone, as advocated by the African Union.

As a member of the Group of 21, my country, Cameroon, has also embraced the resolution adopted by the Heads of State and Government at the Fifteenth Summit

Conference of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held in Sharm El Sheikh, Egypt, from 11 to 16 July 2009. It is for this reason that Cameroon, by way of illustration, opted for a peaceful settlement of the dispute with its neighbouring sister republic, Nigeria, over the Bakassi peninsula and land and sea borders shared by the two countries.

Nevertheless, while advocating the ideal, which is to see our world living in peace and therefore rid of these odious weapons, Cameroon is also aware that States and Governments need to have the necessary and appropriate military resources if they are to guarantee the safety and security of the people for whom they are responsible and to ensure their nation's sovereignty and independence; this is why Cameroon seeks to maintain a just balance between the need to promote disarmament and the imperatives of guaranteeing the stability and sovereignty of every State.

The Conference on Disarmament places heavy demands in terms of its historic, eminent and lofty task which enables it to live up to the expectations placed on it by the entire international community. This is why, given the difficulties that the Conference faces in these highly uncertain times, it seems to me highly desirable that the Conference on Disarmament succeed in its resolute efforts to overcome these difficulties so that it may set about making its noble ideals a reality.

With this in mind, certain questions almost inevitably arise: can the Conference on Disarmament continue to enjoy undisputed competency and legitimacy in the quest for collective security? This is one question one might ask. Are the Conference's legal and regulatory structure and the political will that underlies it still sufficient to guarantee the efficiency and effectiveness of the Conference? This is another question one might ask. Are the Conference's working methods still adequate to the demands posed by the challenging times in which we live? This question, too, might well be asked. These are the issues on which we need to focus. Cameroon sincerely welcomes the wise decision of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to convene a meeting in New York on 24 September 2010 on the familiar topic of "revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations".

On behalf of the highest authorities of the State of Cameroon, I should like to congratulate most warmly His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon for this forward-looking initiative, which is a challenge to us all, and to express my fervent wish that this meeting in New York will be successful. There is an urgent, not to say imperative, need to resolve the current deadlock so that the Conference on Disarmament can once again carry out its noble and exalted tasks. Yes, the Conference must truly revitalize itself, instead of just continuing to exist and resting on its acknowledged past achievements.

*(spoke in English)*

I thank all the members of the Conference and, through them, the international community for their undiminished resolve to deliberate and debate on disarmament issues in order to make our world safer.

However, what we need today is for this forum to negotiate multilateral treaties that strengthen the security of all States through the advancement of what Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon has called "the rule of law in disarmament".

Let us decide together to proceed, to move forward in this direction towards a more secure future for the whole international community, considering the positive impact of a better allocation of financial resources for development in the world and, particularly, for the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.

I am convinced, Cameroon is convinced, that our common and strong political will shall make this possible.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): We have just heard the statement of His Excellency the Minister of External Relations of Cameroon. The substance of his statement has given us proof, if proof were still needed, of Cameroon's unreserved commitment to the cause of disarmament. Sir, I extend my sincerest thanks to you for your words of wisdom.

I should now like to request a brief suspension of the meeting while I escort the Minister of External Relations of Cameroon, who is returning to his hotel, from the hall.

*The meeting was suspended at 10.05 a.m. and resumed at 10.40 a.m.*

**The President** (*spoke in French*): Allow me to begin by extending to you my heartfelt thanks. I sincerely thank you for the trust you have shown in me while I serve as President of the Conference on Disarmament. It is an honour and a privilege, which I accept with great humility. I come before you today to offer my humble assurances that I am placing myself entirely at your disposal so that together we may work, hand in hand, if not to achieve all the objectives set for us, then at least to move forward in general. I will be available to hear your concerns and will likewise come to you for advice and input, in the best interests of the diplomatic community of Geneva assembled here within the Conference on Disarmament, and, of course, in the best interests of our Conference. I thank you most sincerely.

Let us now proceed to consider the items on our agenda. Here I should like to take this opportunity to bid my farewells, our farewells and the farewells of the ambassadors of the States members of the Conference on Disarmament to Ambassador Magnus Hellgren of Sweden, who is taking a sabbatical after having worked tirelessly in Geneva for the past six years.

On behalf of the Conference and on my own behalf I wish him every success in his future endeavours, and I trust that during his sabbatical we, the members of the Conference on Disarmament, will remain in his thoughts so that we, too, may be able to move forward.

I should now like to share with you my objectives with regard to the following four issues: first, our programme of work; secondly, the High-Level Meeting of 24 September convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Ban Ki-moon; thirdly, the reports of the informal meetings on the substantive agenda items, as indicated in working paper CD/WP.560; and, lastly, the draft annual report of the 2010 session of the Conference on Disarmament.

My intention with regard to the programme of work is to continue consultations with a view to reaching agreement on a proposal acceptable to all before the end of this session. I would draw your attention to the fact that this session ends on 24 September 2010.

With regard to the planned meeting of the Conference and the High-Level Meeting on 24 September, I need to consult further with the delegations regarding the "format", given the divergence of opinions among regional groups. As I understand it, some delegations favour the idea of "informal informal" meetings, while others would prefer a plenary meeting or an ordinary informal meeting. I hope that together we can reach agreement on the matter so that this important discussion can take place as soon as possible. I hope that this can be done before the end of next week, if possible.

Now, with regard to the informal meetings that were held on agenda items 1 to 7 in June and July, I am pleased to inform you that I have received all seven coordinators' reports. In accordance with the procedure established in previous years, I have addressed a letter to the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament transmitting the content of the reports to him. The coordinators prepared the reports themselves with a great deal of care and attention while I finalized them under my own responsibility.

A last but no less important matter is the draft report of the Conference on Disarmament for 2010 (CD/WP.561). The draft report was circulated to delegations yesterday. I believe that you all have a copy. It has been circulated first in English, since, for various reasons, it will be some time before translations of the document into other languages are available. Nonetheless, I intend to begin consideration of the report at the start of next week, given the all-important date of 24 September 2010. In this connection, I should like to remind you that the next working week will be a short one as there will be two official United Nations holidays. The first, on 9 September, will mark the local *Jeûne Genevois* holiday, while the second, on 10 September, will, God willing, mark the festivities associated with our Muslim holiday, Eid al-Fitr. I would also ask delegations to bear in mind that it would be preferable if we could adopt the annual report as soon as possible as this will facilitate their participation in the High-Level Meeting in New York on 24 September.

Lastly, I would like to draw delegations' attention to the information note concerning the High-Level Meeting to be held on 24 September that has been circulated in the conference room. The Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament can provide you with more detailed information if required.

These, then, are the observations I wished to make at the start of this presidency. I should now like to give the floor to the distinguished representatives who have asked to speak. I have on my list His Excellency Mr. Rezlan Ishar Jenie, Deputy Minister for Multilateral Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia.

**Mr. Jenie** (Indonesia): Mr. President, at the outset, allow me to congratulate you on your presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. I assure you of my delegation's full cooperation and support in discharging your duties. May I also express my sincere gratitude to Ambassador Ganev for his tireless efforts during Bulgaria's presidency, as well as to the past Presidents for their determined contributions to the Conference on Disarmament.

Allow me to start by recalling that 2010 marks the thirty-second anniversary of the adoption of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I). This is a landmark document that has strengthened the role and responsibilities of the United Nations in the area of disarmament and established the existing multilateral disarmament machinery.

Indonesia continues to reaffirm the importance and the relevance of the Conference on Disarmament as the world's sole multilateral disarmament treaty negotiating body as well as the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) as the specialized deliberative body within the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery.

However, over the past decade it is fair to say that progress in nuclear disarmament has been absent. The political atmosphere in New York and Geneva has not permitted much more than the maintenance of existing relevant disarmament and non-proliferation treaties. Concrete progress with a meaningful outcome has so far proven elusive within the consensus-based United Nations disarmament machinery.

Nevertheless, this year we have witnessed some positive developments in the sphere of nuclear disarmament, beginning with the signing of the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) between the United States of America and the Russian Federation, followed by the convening of the Global Nuclear Security Summit and the positive outcome of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

For our part, we welcome every opportunity to advance the multilateral disarmament agenda. Therefore, we believe that it is imperative for us to build on the momentum created

by these events to contribute further to efforts aimed at the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

We also saw a glimmer of hope when the Conference adopted the programme of work during the 2009 session, but deeply regret the fact that the Conference has not been able to agree on its implementation.

Indonesia remains very concerned about the danger posed by the continued existence of abundant nuclear weapons and considers the achievement of total nuclear disarmament as its highest priority. We urge nuclear-weapon States to undertake concrete disarmament efforts with a view to reducing and eliminating all types of nuclear weapons. We must work intensively together to produce a universal nuclear weapons convention with a specific timeline for the attainment of complete nuclear disarmament.

If we accept the principle that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, we have to recognize that a mere declaration by a nuclear-weapon State is neither sufficient nor adequate. Therefore, we underscore the legitimate interest of non-nuclear-weapon States in receiving unequivocal and legally binding security assurances from nuclear-weapon States.

With regard to fissile materials, Indonesia wishes to see a treaty that is non-discriminatory and effectively verifiable. The treaty should cover not only future production but also existing stockpiles to ensure that such materials will not be utilized or diverted for producing nuclear weapons. Hence, a fissile material treaty should serve as a legal instrument which addresses the issues of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

As the promotion of international peace and security is mandated by our Constitution, we have consistently been of the view that the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) is a key element in the international regime for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. As an Annex II State, Indonesia has chosen in the past to withhold its ratification pending ratification by all the nuclear-weapon States and other States claiming possession of nuclear weapons. For it is they who must first and foremost commit to CTBT.

That position of principle, we believe, has served its purpose. Today, from the vantage point of the year 2010, and in view of the present glimmer of hope on the nuclear disarmament agenda, the Government of Indonesia believes that it can now enhance its contribution by initiating its own ratification process. The time for waiting is over. It is time to act. This will hopefully encourage other States that have not ratified the Treaty to do the same.

We will also make use of our chairmanship of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) next year to take the lead in resolving pending issues towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region.

We recalled that matter in the plenary meeting of 24 August 2010 and derived benefit from the discussion held on the preparation for the upcoming high-level meeting initiated by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. We support the continued discussion in plenary session of matters pertaining to the upcoming high-level meeting and would like to take this opportunity to share our views.

We welcome the initiative by the Secretary-General of the United Nations as recommended by the 2010 NPT Review Conference. As mentioned in the invitation letter from the Secretary-General, the purpose of the upcoming high-level meeting on 24 September 2010 on revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations is to provide a unique opportunity to examine the work of the Conference on Disarmament, discuss ways and means to revitalize its work and build consensus on the larger challenges facing the wider architecture of the disarmament machinery.

It is our hope that the meeting will strengthen efforts towards multilateral negotiation. Thus, it should not initiate a parallel negotiation process on all issues under the agenda items of the Conference on Disarmament.

We share the view that the five-hour meeting to be held in New York next month is no guarantee that the current impasse in the Conference will be resolved. However, we believe that the summary of the meeting will reflect the views of member States in a balanced and comprehensive manner and will strengthen the role and work of the Conference as mandated by SSOD-I.

It is also our hope that the meeting will generate support for the convening of the fourth special session on disarmament to discuss issues and machinery relating to disarmament in a comprehensive manner.

We would like to reiterate the Indonesian delegation's full support and express our readiness to continue consultations on any proposals aimed at fostering consensus on the programme of work, such as those presented during the 2009 session. To this end, we would like to appeal to everyone in this meeting room to show more flexibility and political will so that we can move forward, keeping in mind that we have a responsibility towards the international community.

Let me also take this opportunity to reiterate the importance of the involvement of people at grass-roots level in the process. In this regard, we support the enhanced participation of civil society in the Conference on Disarmament, not only to garner support at the grass-roots level, but also in recognition of civil society's potential to come up with resourceful thinking on how to move forward the discussion in the Conference. We believe that such engagement will create a much-needed political impetus to enhance the Conference and contribute to its progress.

To conclude, let me once again emphasize the point that we should not lose the momentum that has been built up this year. We should not let such events be an end in themselves, but a means to achieving the noble intentions set out 32 years ago.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): Thank you, Sir, for your gracious words of wisdom. The Conference on Disarmament will take them into consideration. I should now like to give the floor to the Ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, His Excellency Mr. So Se Pyong.

**Mr. So Se Pyong** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Mr. President, let me at the outset mention that I regard it an honour to join you today as the new Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Let me also express my appreciation to all of you who have already welcomed me in joining the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

Allow me to take this opportunity to congratulate you on taking over the presidency and to wish you every success in your leadership from now on. In the meantime, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea commends Mr. Henri Eyebe Ayissi, Minister of External Relations of the Republic of Cameroon, and Mr. Rezlan Ishar Jenie, Deputy Minister for Multilateral Affairs of Indonesia, for their addresses at this plenary meeting today. I also express my gratitude to all previous presidents for their utmost effort to ensure the progress of the work of the Conference from the very beginning of the year.

Nuclear disarmament remains the most pressing issue in ensuring world peace and security because it is directly linked to the survival of humankind before it relates to world peace and security. Humankind has witnessed with its own eyes the danger of nuclear weapons from the disastrous and brutal ravage of the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan.

That is why the Democratic People's Republic of Korea believes that nuclear disarmament is the prime issue to be addressed in the field of disarmament, since disarmament can be said to have attained its goal when the total elimination of nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament is achieved.

Therefore, it is urgent to address the issue of removing all sorts of nuclear threats, putting an end to the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, withdrawing nuclear weapons deployed abroad, withdrawing the nuclear umbrella provided to other countries and offering negative security assurances, etc.

Non-proliferation, apart from nuclear disarmament, does not make sense in guaranteeing world peace and security.

The role of the Conference on Disarmament, the sole multilateral negotiating mechanism on disarmament, is vital for achieving nuclear disarmament, and in particular for international efforts to ensure world peace and security. The international community has high expectations that the Conference on Disarmament will realize Global Zero in the near future.

In this regard, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is ready to discuss all disarmament issues, including nuclear disarmament, by adopting the programme of work for the Conference as soon as possible.

It is the view of my delegation that the programme of work should be inclusive and balanced, which fully reflects the security interests of each nation, and be acceptable to all member States.

In so doing, the Conference on Disarmament will have to observe the rules of consensus and conduct open-minded discussions by tabling all issues with transparency. At the same time, any actions that might have a negative effect on the adoption of the programme of work should be avoided. In this regard, my delegation appeals to all delegations to make every possible effort in order to reach the best solution.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea took a similar stance in order to bring about durable peace and achieve the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.

In this context, the priority is confidence-building between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States – the parties chiefly responsible for putting the process of a nuclear-free-zone in the peninsula back on the right track. Confidence-building between the parties is the most urgent priority and the master key to the solution of the problems.

If confidence is to be built, it is essential to conclude a peace treaty between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States in order to terminate the end of the state of war on the peninsula, which is the main cause of the hostile relations. The conclusion of a peace treaty is the only reasonable and realistic way towards the denuclearization of the peninsula.

At present, the abnormal situations, including all kinds of military exercises around the Korean peninsula, prove the urgency of the conclusion of this peace treaty. Had durable peace already been achieved on the Korean peninsula, neither the nuclear issue nor the issue of denuclearization would have been raised.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will cooperate with you and remain constructively engaged in the work of the Conference on Disarmament next Monday.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): Thank you, Sir. Speaking as President of the Conference, I should like to extend a warm welcome to you here in Geneva and offer my



congratulations on your appointment to this position of great responsibility. Your words are a source of inspiration on which we should all reflect, and I would like each of us to pause for a moment to consider your statement and to act accordingly, particularly with regard to the programme of work, so that some kind of consensus, however fragile, may be achieved and that by the end of this meeting we may be in a position to adopt the much-discussed programme of work. Thank you very much, Excellency.

I should now like to give the floor to the distinguished Ambassador of Pakistan, Mr. Zamir Akram.

**Mr. Akram (Pakistan):** Mr. President, I would like to begin by congratulating you on assuming the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament as the last President of the 2010 session. We are confident that you will be able to steer the work of the Conference in a professional manner. Pakistan and Cameroon have excellent bilateral relations. We welcome and appreciate the presence of the foreign minister of Cameroon at the Conference to inaugurate Cameroon's presidency. We assure you of our fullest cooperation and assistance.

May I also take this opportunity to welcome the Deputy Minister for Multilateral Affairs of Indonesia and express our appreciation for the statement made by him. We would also like to welcome the Ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and bid a regretful farewell to our friend, Magnus Hellgren of Sweden.

Earlier in February this year, at the commencement of the 2010 session, I made a detailed statement explaining Pakistan's position on the agenda items that constitute the work of the Conference. As we now approach the end of the 2010 session, it is time to evaluate developments during this period.

The Conference on Disarmament, as we all know, does not operate in a vacuum. It is obviously influenced by the various developments in the international arena. Much has been said about the positive developments that have taken place internationally in the context of arms control, non-proliferation, disarmament and nuclear security.

We in the Conference on Disarmament have been fortunate to benefit from the wisdom of several foreign ministers and other dignitaries who have addressed this Conference. The informal meetings of the Conference on various agenda items have also been extremely useful in providing an insight into the positions of member States on several important issues.

Nevertheless, we have to agree with those who have argued that the positive developments around the world relating to the work of the Conference on Disarmament have not had any impact on ensuring substantive progress in this body. While we collectively lament this fact, we need to question why this is so. Only then will we be able to break this deadlock in the future.

In our opinion, there are three reasons for the impasse in the work of the Conference. The first is that the noble words that have been uttered at the highest levels about arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament have not been translated into deeds. If that had been done, would there not have been progress in the Conference with its core agenda item, nuclear disarmament? However, there has been no action in the Conference to implement this commitment by the major nuclear powers.

The second reason for the stalemate in the Conference is the pursuit of discriminatory policies by some States in the field of nuclear collaboration, in flagrant violation of the international non-proliferation regime and their own international commitments, to the detriment of the security interests of affected States.

The third factor is the refusal of some States to recognize the reality that arms control and disarmament measures can only be concluded by taking into account the security interests of all States and based on the principle of undiminished and equal security for all.

It is the combination of these three negative factors that has prevented the adoption of a programme of work. As long as these negative factors persist, substantive progress in the Conference will remain elusive.

It is indeed ironic that those member States that have been the most vociferous in their attempt to apportion blame for the stalemate in the Conference are the ones who are most responsible for this state of affairs due to their acts of omission and commission. While they have spoken out most eloquently about their commitment to non-proliferation and disarmament within this august assembly, their policies outside the Conference can only be described as cynical and hypocritical. They have sacrificed their self-professed principles at the altar of profit and power politics.

In our statement delivered on 18 February this year, we outlined our position with cogent reasons that negotiations on a treaty that bans only the future production of fissile material will undermine our security by freezing the asymmetries in stockpiles within our region. The discriminatory nuclear cooperation arrangements in our region concluded over the recent past will further widen these asymmetries and accentuate our security concerns. Therefore, negotiation of a mere cut-off treaty is neither possible, nor feasible for us nor practical for regional and global security. In these circumstances, I want to state most categorically that Pakistan cannot compromise on its security interests and the imperative of maintaining a credible minimum deterrence.

The informal discussions that have taken place in the Conference on Disarmament during the course of this year on the issue of fissile materials have clearly underscored the preference of a large number of member States for a fissile material treaty that not only bans the future production of fissile material, but also seeks a reduction in existing stockpiles of fissile material. Only such a treaty can truly be a disarmament measure.

On the other hand, a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) that bans only the future production of fissile material would not even constitute a non-proliferation step towards disarmament, given the huge existing stocks of fissile materials that will continue to remain in the possession of the major nuclear-weapon States – stocks that can easily be converted into weapons at short notice.

Some delegations have argued that inclusion of a reference to the Shannon mandate in the proposed programme of work provides the so-called “constructive ambiguity” under which the issue of stockpiles can be raised in the proposed FMCT negotiations. In our view, given the qualitative transformation that has taken place in our region owing to discriminatory nuclear cooperation agreements, there is now no longer any room for such constructive ambiguity. Our security imperatives demand that it should be very clear at the very outset what is to be negotiated.

Even if some member States may be misled by the mirage of the Shannon mandate, the recently held informal discussions should leave them under no illusions. As Pakistan has believed all along, and indeed has repeatedly stated, some of the key nuclear-weapon States are not prepared to include the issue of reduction of stocks in the negotiations of a treaty on fissile materials. Their argument that reduction of stocks could be achieved unilaterally or bilaterally is unrealistic.

Our discussions and especially the input from technical experts have indicated that the argument that the reduction of stocks is not verifiable is incorrect. We now know that reliable verification of the reduction of stocks is possible.

Some countries have also clearly indicated that they wish to pursue FMCT negotiations that narrowly define fissile materials and limit the scope of the treaty, even though there are legitimate grounds for a wider definition and scope for these negotiations. The issues of verification and entry into force also leave Pakistan and several other countries in grave doubt about the intentions of some nuclear-weapon States.

What is most remarkable is the fact that the positions of most of the nuclear-weapon States on various aspects of the FMCT — definition, scope, verification, etc. — are nearly identical. Consequently, there is the danger that a flawed and unfair treaty could be pushed through by these nuclear powers, which will protect only their interests. It is also quite likely that, as happened in the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), those States with reservations would be pressurized into accepting such a flawed treaty.

In this context, it is interesting to consider the current status of the international non-proliferation regime. If we were to cut through the layers of hype and hypocrisy, it is obvious that the special dispensations given to some States outside the NPT have reduced the NPT and the NSG to a farce. It seems that if the price is right, all rules can be broken.

Moreover, it is ironic that those who are members of the NPT continue to be denied its benefits in terms of nuclear cooperation for peaceful purposes, yet those outside the NPT and with a proven record of proliferation, have become the recipients of dual-use nuclear cooperation from several NPT and NSG member States. Such discrimination and double standards are eventually self-defeating.

It is, therefore, not through choice, but necessity, that Pakistan is opposed to negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty. The responsibility for this lies not with Pakistan, but with those countries that have been driven by the lust for power and profit to bring about a qualitative change in the strategic environment in our region, and, in the process, have drastically undermined the international non-proliferation and disarmament machinery, including the Conference on Disarmament.

While we have repeatedly stated our position with absolute clarity on the FMCT, we have also made it clear that Pakistan remains fully prepared to make progress on all the other issues on the Conference agenda. The Conference should not be kept hostage to the FMCT issue. It should not be treated as a forum to negotiate one issue only, and in case of a lack of consensus on that issue, it should not be depicted as a paralysed body. This august assembly has a broad agenda and a comprehensive purpose, bigger and broader than the FMCT.

Indeed, the *raison d'être* of the Conference on Disarmament is to negotiate comprehensive nuclear disarmament. That remains its core function. It is tragic, therefore, that while the issue of nuclear disarmament has withered on the vine, only the FMCT is considered to be ripe for negotiations. This position is contrary to the very genesis and functioning of the Conference.

We have joined the Group of 21 (G-21) in its unanimous position on commencing work on nuclear disarmament. We are also ready for negotiations on negative security assurances and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. If some members have genuine and legitimate reasons to block the Conference's work on these issues, they should say so clearly and unambiguously with reasons, as we have done with regard to the FMCT.

I would also like to state once again that progress on these other three core issues before the Conference should be possible, as this forum has engaged on these issues in the past and should be able to do so now, especially given the favourable international environment that is claimed to exist at present.

In our view, the Conference should make progress and engage in substantive work on those issues on which there is consensus. Since there is no consensus on the FMCT, there is no reason why we cannot make progress on the other three core agenda items.

Some delegations have argued that the programme of work is a package deal and cannot be implemented without negotiations on the FMCT. It is worth recalling that, in the past, these same delegations have strongly argued against any linkages between issues on the Conference agenda. Such inconsistency and duplicity is indeed deplorable.

Some major powers and their allies present at the Conference on Disarmament have called for a review of its rules of procedure, in particular the principle of consensus, due to the current stalemate. It is interesting to note that these very delegations did not question the consensus principle in the 10 years prior to 2009, when this Conference remained stymied owing to the policies of some members.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that the principle of consensus is the central pillar of the Conference on Disarmament. It protects the interests of all. It is the necessary equalizer that enables the Conference to work on the basis of ensuring the security of all States. Only the Conference can change its rules of procedure based on that consensus.

We have also heard that the CTBT model should be followed to push FMCT negotiations and a group of like-minded countries could simply start negotiations amongst themselves in the plenary meetings of the Conference on Disarmament. With due respect, I would like to refresh the memories of member States that the CTBT was negotiated in the Conference's Ad Hoc Committee with a clear and agreed negotiating mandate, and not at the will of some members. The Conference's rules must be respected under all circumstances.

It has also been proposed by some member States that, in view of the impasse in the work of the Conference, other options should be explored for negotiating an FMCT. Pakistan, along with a large number of countries, remains firmly committed to the Conference on Disarmament as the sole negotiating body for disarmament. As such, we will not be able to join any endeavour to negotiate an FMCT outside the Conference. We are confident that a number of other countries will adopt a similar position.

Before concluding, I would like to comment briefly on the proposal by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to hold a meeting in support of the work of the Conference on Disarmament in New York on 24 September 2010. The merit of holding a half-day meeting in which high-level participants will be allowed only a few minutes to speak is doubtful at best. Such a high-level meeting should have been better planned and prepared to ensure a truly substantive outcome, deserving of the Secretary-General's position and prestige.

In our view, a substantive outcome of such a high-level meeting should be based on the following key considerations. First, the work of the Conference and indeed of the entire international disarmament machinery can proceed only on the basis of ensuring the security of all States. Any initiative that undermines the security of a State will not succeed.

Second, the Conference agenda covers a number of critical issues and all issues need to be considered in an equal and balanced manner. There can be no preferential treatment of any one issue to the exclusion of other agenda items.

Third, unfortunately, some States are willing to negotiate a treaty on one issue only, while other core issues on the Conference agenda are being excluded or relegated to the level of discussion only.

Fourth, lack of progress on one issue due to the security concerns of States should not lead to an impasse in the Conference on Disarmament, as other issues on its agenda can

and should be taken up for consideration, especially since these have been on the Conference agenda since its creation.

Fifth, the impasse in the Conference is not due to its rules of procedure or working methods but to the security concerns of States. Accordingly, these security concerns need to be addressed in order to facilitate the work of the Conference.

Sixth, any attempt to amend the rules of procedure, especially the rule of consensus, would unravel the Conference on Disarmament and gravely harm the global disarmament machinery.

Last, while the meeting called by the Secretary-General could provide a useful platform for discussions, substantive efforts to revitalize the Conference and take forward multilateral disarmament measures would be better served by convening a fourth special session on disarmament, as proposed by Pakistan along with a number of other countries.

Unfortunately, in the present circumstances, there is no clear idea about the substantive outcome of the high-level meeting. If the outcome is to be a summary prepared by the Secretariat for the Secretary-General, would it have any binding value for member States? If we or members of the Non-Aligned Movement are unable to participate in its formulation, the outcome will certainly not be binding on us.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): Thank you, Ambassador Akram, for your detailed and insightful statement. It calls for reflection on all our parts.

I should now like to give the floor to the Ambassador of Sweden, Mr. Magnus Hellgren, who is leaving us. We are all ears.

**Mr. Hellgren** (Sweden): Mr. President, first of all, since it is the first time I take the floor during your presidency, but also the last, allow me to wish you every success in your important office in the remaining part of this session and pledge the full support of the Swedish delegation for your work. Also, I want to thank you and the Ambassador of Pakistan for the kind words expressed to me earlier today and welcome the new Ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to this Conference.

After having had the honour of representing my country at this Conference for more than six years, the time has now come to make some personal reflections to bid farewell.

Like many other colleagues, I will leave the Conference with mixed feelings: sadness, over the inability of this Conference to make any substantial contribution to international peace and security for more than a decade; frustration, that all the efforts we all, in one way or another, have put into breaking the deadlock have not made any tangible difference; at moments, I even felt anger that human and financial resources that could have been put to better use have been deliberately wasted. However, most of all, I leave with the conviction that the multilateral work that the Conference is supposed to do is more important than ever and that there are opportunities waiting to be seized.

My first years here were characterized by what I call "the sterile debate of nuclear disarmament versus nuclear non-proliferation". The mutually reinforcing link between, on the one hand, preventing further proliferation and, on the other hand, reversing the proliferation that has taken place since 1945, or what we usually call disarmament, was denied by some. An atmosphere of distrust reigned that made delegations dig in their heels in defence of long-standing positions. Innovative ideas and proposals were discarded by those that were comfortable with the status quo and by those who had unrealistic expectations. Under these circumstances, the continued stalemate in the Conference during those years and, for example, the failure of the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference came as no surprise.

The dismal situation in multilateral arms control was of course not only noticeable in the Conference on Disarmament and the NPT. One of my strongest personal memories from these years in Geneva was the efforts of my delegation and others to coordinate the call for a negotiating mandate on cluster munitions at the Third Review Conference of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (CCW), in light of the evidence from the battlefield of the unacceptable humanitarian impact such weapons could have. Unfortunately, at that moment, what I called the “coalition of the unwilling” blocked the start of such negotiations within the United Nations framework. The humanitarian call for action was too strong, however, and today we instead have the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM), negotiated in an ad hoc process outside the United Nations system. Moreover, somewhat paradoxically, many of those who back in 2006 preferred the stalemate in the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons have belatedly joined us as champions for action on cluster munitions also within the United Nations framework. I sincerely hope that the right lessons are drawn from this experience as regards the issues that we have on the table at the Conference on Disarmament.

Today, when I leave the Conference, the international climate for progress in the fields of disarmament and arms control is much improved. The world is eagerly waiting for the Conference to start delivering. It goes without saying that the task of the Conference on Disarmament is to negotiate legally binding commitments. Several proposals have been on the table for over a decade. Let me touch briefly on some of them.

Preserving outer space so that our and future generations can reap the full benefits of its potential for peaceful technological advances is in my view crucial. The international legal regime to protect the very vulnerable outer space environment clearly needs to be strengthened. Placing strike weapons in space, threatening or attacking satellites and other debris-creating military activities need to be prevented, before it is too late. The international community must address these challenges, yet again, before it is too late. The Conference on Disarmament, which includes all major space-faring nations, would be an excellent forum for such work. However, if nothing happens here, I am convinced that other avenues will be explored, to get things moving. Like climate change, the outer space issue is a truly generational one.

In the era of nuclear weapons, the lack of multilateral legally binding negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States that are respecting their part of the NPT bargain remains an unfulfilled commitment. For many it is viewed as a sore thorn in the NPT regime. Progress on this issue in the Conference would, however, require both doctrinal changes in major nuclear-weapon States and innovative ways of dealing with the non-NPT States. Therefore, I ask the question: can and will these issues best be resolved in the Conference on Disarmament? My answer is perhaps, but, personally, I remain to be convinced after six years here.

The continued production of fissile material for weapons purposes is, in my view, incompatible with the commitment to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world. There is broad international consensus on the need to put a legal cap on such production, as well as to deal appropriately with previously produced stocks. The informal sessions on this topic that I had the honour of chairing this year in the Conference on Disarmament further strengthened this impression, and I must add that my recollection of what was said during these sessions differs from what we heard from the distinguished Ambassador of Pakistan today.

Admittedly, an FMCT may not be the most important stepping stone on the way to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, but it clearly would be a significant and a necessary contribution to achieving and sustaining the so-called Global Zero. For non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT, such a treaty would be what I call a “win-win”

deal. There would be no new obligations on us and new limitations put on the capacities of the States that possess nuclear weapons. I can understand why one of the States which possesses nuclear weapons, as we heard today, that is still producing fissile materials for nuclear weapons, may perceive that its short-term national security interests could be threatened by joining such a treaty. Nonetheless it puzzles me when I hear some non-nuclear-weapon States discarding a fissile material cut-off treaty as, and I quote, “a Western priority”. Since when has this, or any other of the 13 practical steps leading to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, become anything other than a global cause.

As the disarmament process continues towards Global Zero, I believe we will reach the point where all major players will see the need for a negotiated multilateral legal regime beyond the NPT, what I might call an even grander bargain. I sincerely hope that the Conference on Disarmament will still be alive and kicking when the time comes to begin negotiations on such a framework nuclear weapons convention.

Already today, almost all member States of the Conference are ready to start negotiating one small but significant piece of the puzzle, the “fissban” treaty. We heard today that one member State opposes the idea, and so we are stuck. That brings me to the interpretation which has developed over the years in the Conference on Disarmament of the so-called “consensus rule”, not as a commitment to work towards acceptable solutions that everyone can live with in a changing international security environment. However, it is regarded as an absolute and immediate veto right for all member States in all matters, substantial or procedural, big or small. When it comes to protecting national security interests in treaty negotiations, there is even a “triple veto”: you can block the start of negotiations, you can block the approval of any treaty text, and finally, you can choose not to ratify the adopted treaty. My urgent plea to those blocking the adoption of our programme of work here today is to consider not exercising the first “veto opportunity”, since I am convinced that the national security interests, which can also change over time, can be protected, if needed and as needed, by the other two.

The situation in the Conference on Disarmament has, in my view, reached breaking point. Something will have to give. In the improved international environment, in the field of disarmament and arms control that we have witnessed these last two years, the continued stalemate — or, one could say, “no business as usual” — in the Conference on Disarmament is no longer an option. I thus warmly welcome the fact that, on 24 September, the Secretary-General of the United Nations will draw the attention of our political leaders to the dire situation, but also to the great potential of the Conference on Disarmament. Another unproductive session of the Conference in 2011 would seriously undermine the chances of this “august body” retaining its role as the United Nations standing forum for multilateral disarmament negotiations.

That would be very unfortunate because the Conference on Disarmament remains a great idea and a great machine, if only it could be put to its intended use. The diplomatic, military, legal and technical expertise gathered in this hall is impressive. The professionalism, hard work and collegiality of Conference on Disarmament diplomats and experts create an atmosphere where creative solutions can be found for common security challenges.

Despite 13 unproductive years these characteristics of the Conference remain. It has been a true honour for me to get to know, work with and learn from all of you. For that I am truly thankful.

In addition, I want to take this opportunity to thank the Secretary-General of the Conference and the entire secretariat for all its support. Thanks also to the interpreters, of course, who make sense of our sometimes too long and not so clear statements.

Finally, a special thanks to the civil society representatives up on the balcony. I admire your tenacity and thank you for not yet having given up on the Conference. Also hats off to the brilliant Reaching Critical Will website, which has facilitated my professional life so much these last years.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): Ambassador Hellgren, I believe that I speak for everyone when I say that we are going to miss you. The quality, depth and substance of your statement, which merits reflection on all our parts, have confirmed this. Ambassador, may I once again wish you a good sabbatical year. Our dearest wish would be that you could still join us here at the Conference on Disarmament so that you might continue to guide us with your insights. Thank you, Excellency.

(*spoke in English*)

I now call upon the distinguished representative of South Africa.

**Mr. Combrink** (South Africa): Mr. President, may I first of all congratulate you on assuming the position of President of the Conference on Disarmament. Africa has limited representation in the Conference, and it is therefore always a pleasure to see a fellow African representative presiding over its work. I wish to assure you of South Africa's full cooperation and support during this last part of the 2010 session.

I also wish to express our appreciation for the participation of the Minister of External Relations of Cameroon, Mr. Eyebe Ayissi, in today's meeting, and to welcome the Ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Conference on Disarmament and to assure him of my delegation's full cooperation.

At the outset, let me also associate myself with the views expressed by previous speakers regarding the priority and the urgency of nuclear disarmament measures, particularly in the context of the Conference on Disarmament. Since its establishment in 1979, the Conference has been recognized as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. As such, the Conference carries a special responsibility. For many years now, it has been unable to fulfil its basic mandate, that is, to conduct negotiations, primarily due to a continuing procedural debate, which has not allowed it to make progress on any of the substantive issues on its agenda.

The adoption of a programme of work during 2009 signalled to the international community a hope for progress, after many years of stalemate, and an era of resorting to unilateral and other limited initiatives that have not always served our collective security interests.

2010 has been another disappointing year for the Conference, and we fully support the view held by many in this body that it can no longer be business as usual, as Mr. Hellgren has also said.

South Africa has consistently argued that our collective security concerns require sustainable collective solutions that take into account not only the individual security needs of those that continue to hold power in an unequal international system, but ones that reflect our shared security interests. While acknowledging its imperfections and the need for reform, South Africa remains committed to strengthening the multilateral system, including in the area of disarmament.

The continued bickering about procedural issues within the Conference on Disarmament has only served to undermine the role of this important forum. South Africa believes that it is time for us to critically reflect on the approach that we have taken during the last decade and more on the issue of the annual programme of work and how the working methods of the Conference can be improved.



I wish to be clear that we are not contemplating any revision of the Conference's rules of procedure, including the rule of consensus. What we have in mind is a critical reflection on the approach we have taken towards a programme of work, which should be a tool that enables us to structure our work at the beginning of each session, and not an obstacle to progress.

Some in this forum have argued that the current stalemate in the Conference is a mere reflection of external realities that require our attention. What is therefore needed, according to them, is patience in the belief that the Conference on Disarmament will work when it will work. Others have argued that the Conference is out of step with external reality. What we need to consider is whether the current impasse can be sustained or whether the Conference is indeed able to respond to the serious challenges that remain in the disarmament arena.

It is in this context that we welcome the initiative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to convene a high-level meeting aimed at revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament, and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations.

It is our hope that all delegations will seize this opportunity to provide renewed impetus towards progress in the disarmament arena that will contribute towards increased security for all.

Disarmament is not only the business of those with the military might or those represented in the Conference on Disarmament. It is the business of all those who seek a better and more secure world: Governments, members of civil society and ordinary citizens.

We look forward to further engagement among members States of the Conference on Disarmament, between the latter and the wider membership of the United Nations and members of civil society, to explore opportunities to advance our collective security interests.

Lastly, allow me to thank Mr. Magnus Hellgren for his contribution to the work of the Conference, for his cooperation and collegiality. We wish him well in his future endeavours.

**The President:** I thank Mr. Combrink, the distinguished representative of South Africa, and I now give the floor to the distinguished Ambassador of Australia. Ambassador Strohal, you have the floor please.

**Mr. Strohal (Austria):** Mr. President, let me start by congratulating you on the assumption of the presidency and extend to you our best wishes for success. Having been in your position only a year ago, I am well aware of the difficulties you are facing and therefore want to assure you of my delegation's full support in your endeavours.

I would also like to thank you for inviting the foreign minister of Cameroon and the Deputy Minister for Multilateral Affairs of Indonesia, and to welcome the new Ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to our body.

I also thank your predecessors, and in particular, Ambassador Ganev, who provided us only last week with an opportunity to discuss the high-level meeting of 24 September, which I will come back to.

Austria has always been a strong supporter of disarmament and non-proliferation and welcomes the increased interest and political momentum on this issue. It was also encouraged by the successful conclusion of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. In this year of the sixty-fifth anniversary of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it is indeed high time for the Conference on Disarmament to act and to assume its responsibility as the single permanent negotiating forum. For more than a decade, the Conference has

been quite permanent, but not negotiating, and as some of our colleagues have just said, it is not fulfilling its mandate, but risks becoming an end in itself.

It is against this background that Austria wholeheartedly welcomes the initiative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to revitalize multilateral disarmament and the Conference on Disarmament. It is a reflection of his general interest, and I want to thank him for the time he is investing in our work. My delegation certainly looks forward to further discussion of the high-level meeting as well as its potential outcome, in this forum, with all delegations, if you, Mr. President, would deem a further informal meeting necessary. My delegation also thanks the Secretary-General of the United Nations for the information note circulated.

Let me address another topic, and that is the participation of civil society in the work of the Conference on Disarmament. Earlier this year, at the 2010 NPT Review Conference, the international community recognized the important role of civil society and emphasized that nuclear disarmament and achieving the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons will require openness and cooperation. In Action 19 of the Action Plan on Nuclear Disarmament, States agreed on the importance of cooperation among Governments and civil society. Once again, while my delegation believes that the convening of an informal meeting is within your presidential prerogatives, it would definitely welcome a discussion on NGO participation. Austria, for its part, supports the closer involvement and participation of civil society in the work of the Conference, as my delegation has stated on previous occasions.

On the subject of openness and cooperation, allow me also to refer to last week's joint statement from the observer countries read out by the distinguished Ambassador of Serbia. Austria is of the view that nuclear disarmament is everybody's business, and that we cannot exclude the overwhelming majority of States from our deliberations. By excluding these States and civil society from our work, and by not granting them the full right to participate appropriately in our meetings, we are depriving ourselves of the benefits of their ideas, their knowledge and their experience. The group of observer States now has more members than any other regional group in the Conference on Disarmament, but, more importantly, it encompasses States from different regions bound by a common goal. I think that this is something we should all aspire to in our endeavours, in assuming our responsibilities and addressing the challenges on the nuclear disarmament agenda together.

I cannot conclude without expressing my appreciation for having been able to work alongside Magnus Hellgren. His expertise, his dedication, and his constant openness to cooperation are, and certainly will, truly remain an example to all of us.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): It is I who must convey my thanks to Ambassador Strohal for his statement. I now give the floor to Ms. Žunec-Brandt, the distinguished representative of Croatia.

**Ms. Žunec Brandt** (Croatia): Mr. President, let me welcome you to the position of President at this important time for the Conference on Disarmament and assure you of my delegation's full support. Allow me also to thank the outgoing president of Bulgaria for all his efforts and for actively involving the informal group of observer States.

Inspired by the vivid discussions we had a week ago on the topic of the coming high-level meeting in New York, my delegation is looking forward to continuing consultations in whatever form that we can agree to.

Croatia, as an observer State and applicant for membership of the Conference on Disarmament since 1994, a committed member State of all major legal instruments and processes in the area of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control and a small non-

nuclear-weapon State, is vitally interested in the success of the Conference and, more widely, in the effective functioning of the multilateral disarmament machinery as a whole.

That is why we wholeheartedly welcome the initiative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to hold a high-level meeting. Croatia is pleased that the high-level meeting involves all States Members of the United Nations and our major relevant partner organizations. Croatia is ready to contribute actively to the debate: our Minister for Foreign Affairs and European Integration intends to participate.

Now let me share with you just some of the short and concrete points on revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament that my delegation has gathered sitting on the observers' bench and which we believe would have great positive implications for the wider disarmament machinery.

First, Croatia holds the belief that greater inclusiveness and openness in this body will lead to its greater effectiveness and accountability. We obviously support the statement of the informal group of observer States delivered last week by the Ambassador of Serbia, in which we jointly called for the expansion of the Conference on Disarmament and the appointment of a special coordinator on expansion of the membership of the Conference for next year. However, greater inclusiveness does not mean only the expansion of the membership of the Conference, but also the active engagement of civil society in its work, as other delegations have pointed out.

Second, Croatia has a keen interest in seeing real progress in the work of the Conference on all core issues, at whatever pace it is ready to keep. I would not like to elaborate here on the definitions of being mature or enter into any culinary debate, not being the best cook myself.

Third, the root of the Conference stalemate does not lie in procedural matters. However, dissolving the existing regional groups does seem like a step that would improve communication here. The only real thematic substantial groups my delegation can see in this room are the group of nuclear-weapon States and the group of non-nuclear-weapon States. That is clear. The informal group of observer States which Croatia belongs to includes States from all existing regional and political groups, and the only thing that we really have in common is that we are all non-nuclear-weapon States and intend to stay so. Even although joining the nuclear-weapon States would guarantee us membership of the Conference on Disarmament, I do not think we are ready to go that far.

So, based on these three points, try to imagine the Conference in 2011 with an enlarged membership, dissolved regional groups, negotiation on all core issues, with the active engagement of civil society. Would that not be a change? After almost 15 years of stalemate we certainly have some catching up to do.

Let me just at the end welcome the newcomers and bid farewell to those leaving, and I apologize for possibly taking too long.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): Thank you very much, Ms. Žunec-Brandt. I would now like to give the floor to Mr. Duncan, Ambassador of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

(*spoke in English*)

Mr. Ambassador, you have the floor please.

**Mr. Duncan** (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Mr. President, let me join others in congratulating you on the assumption of your presidency and wish you every success in the coming weeks. We got off to an excellent start with the speech by the two ministers this morning.

I would also like to thank our departing good friend, Magnus Hellgren, for his vision, enthusiasm and determination over the years, as exemplified by his eloquent speech, and wish him all the very best for the future.

I wanted to take the floor in order to respond to the statement by our esteemed colleague from Pakistan, who has, unfortunately, departed, but I hope that his distinguished deputy will pass on our comments to him.

The explanation set out in his statement was indeed helpful for learning more about the detailed position of each country on the nature of an eventual FMCT and is of course a useful exercise, should such negotiations be allowed to commence. As a nuclear-weapon State and signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the United Kingdom accepted a legally binding formal commitment to disarm which has led to the reduction of our nuclear arms stockpile by 70 per cent since the end of the cold war. We completely understand that disarmament is a sensitive security issue. We perhaps understand it better than most.

However, that is really not the point at issue. The point, as we are all well aware, is that several proposals have been drafted, as Mr. Hellgren explained, and that last year a remarkable cross-regional consensus emerged, led by a leading member of the Non-Aligned Movement, set out in document CD/1864. It was a situation where we moved beyond efforts to pre-negotiate the treaty and its mandate, a fatal error in multilateral endeavours, to agreeing that work should begin and that no issue was “off the table”.

It is with profound regret that in the last 20 months we have observed and moved backwards in this organization. The spirit of compromise of last year has, unfortunately, evaporated all too rapidly. Well, perhaps it has moved to other forums, as others have alluded. We have gone back to the position where some nations have decided to block the collective will of the world community. This is quite a different thing from taking the view that whatever the outcome of a negotiation, a State could not subscribe to the principles or sign up to the eventual treaty. The latter position is indeed the position of some in this room, and that is well known. However, the more important point is that that position has been standard practice for multilateral disarmament over the past 40 years. It is the basis under which all the acronyms on our agenda have been negotiated, and that is the basis on which progress has been made. It follows that the United Kingdom does not recognize the veiled accusations or the description of the situation given by my Pakistani colleague.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): I thank you, Ambassador Duncan, for your statement. I now give the floor to Ms. Kennedy, Ambassador of the United States of America.

**Ms. Kennedy** (United States of America): Mr. President, I would like to welcome you to the presidency, congratulate you and say that we of course very much look forward to working with you. It was an honour to hear directly from your foreign minister. It was similarly an honour to hear from the Indonesian Deputy Minister for Multilateral Affairs.

I would also like to welcome our new colleague from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. I have noted his comments on interaction between the United States and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. I would simply point to the Six-Party Talks as a key forum for dealing with these crucial issues, but respectfully note that the Conference on Disarmament is not the appropriate forum to tackle such issues.

I would like to bid a fond and respectful farewell to our Swedish colleague and heartily endorse the accolades sent his way. He has indeed been a brilliant contributor to this forum. I particularly appreciated his work facilitating the informal meetings on the FMCT, which leads me to a few very ad hoc comments I wanted to offer in response to the

comprehensive and, as always, very carefully thought-out statement by our distinguished Pakistani colleague.

I did note his comment about contrasting words and deeds. I would simply say that I think our words, our commitments to non-proliferation and disarmament, have indeed been accompanied by deeds, which we have been eager to share with this forum. They include the negotiation and current ratification of a new START Treaty, our work on transparency in terms of our nuclear stockpile (down to some 80 per cent), our commitment to CTBT ratification and preparations for it, the Nuclear Security Summit and the NPT Action Plan. Of course, I realize that some member States of the Conference on Disarmament are not members of the NPT, but I think it constituted a quite extraordinary commitment agreement amongst 189 States. I would also point to action on nuclear-weapon-free zones. Regarding outer space, we were eager to brief this body on our new space policy.

We very much look forward to engaging in a balanced programme of work, and we participated in all the informal meetings relating to items on the Conference agenda. As part of a balanced programme of work, we are indeed very eager to begin negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty, whose merits our Swedish colleague very ably discussed. We certainly agree that it would be the next major step on the way to Global Zero.

Concerning the comments made about security interests, my Government believes that each and every nation State in the Conference on Disarmament could ably negotiate an FMCT on the basis of undiminished security. As for the comments regarding the mirage of the Shannon mandate, I see it not as a mirage, but as a very carefully delineated viewpoint that indeed acknowledges that the issue of scope would be negotiated in a treaty. As for concerns that a treaty would be forced down the throats of some participants in this body, I would again point to the role of consensus as a means of affording equal protection to us all.

Let me end here. I do indeed have comments on the high-level meeting; but in deference to the President's prerogative to schedule a further exchange of views, I will defer those comments until that time.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): Thank you, Ambassador Kennedy. I now give the floor to Mr. Im Han-taek, Ambassador of the Republic of Korea.

**Mr. Im Han-taek** (Republic of Korea): Mr. President, like others, I would like to express my thanks and my congratulations to you on assuming the presidency at this critical time. As we all know, the Conference on Disarmament is at a critical stage, and there are many scenarios about the future of the Conference, but we believe that under your able leadership, we can get through these difficult times.

My thanks also go to the Minister of External Relations of Cameroon and also the Deputy Minister for Multilateral Affairs of Indonesia for sharing their wisdom with Conference member States. I would also like to extend my best wishes to Mr. Hellgren of Sweden. We all know that he has been a great asset to our work over the years. I convey to him my good wishes in his new endeavours. I extend a welcome to the incoming Ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. I found his statement to be rather encouraging, and we are looking forward to working closely with the delegations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

I asked for the floor to explain our position on the issue of the conclusion of the peace treaty, which was raised by the Ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. I believe that some of you may be interested in listening to what position we are taking on this particular matter.

There are two points. First, we believe that the conclusion of this peace treaty might be our ultimate goal in achieving peace and prosperity on the Korean peninsula, but we also

believe, as was indicated by United States Ambassador, Ms. Laura Kennedy, that there is an ongoing process, called the Six-Party Talks, and that in order to move that process forward, it is very important for the countries concerned to be more forthcoming. A joint effort must be made in order to create a good environment in which that momentum can be gathered.

Second, we have some different views on the participants to the peace treaty. We believe that the role of the Republic of Korea is critical in concluding the treaty. In that sense, we believe the Republic of Korea's participation is a prerequisite.

In response to the views expressed by the distinguished Ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, with your permission, I would like to quote part of a speech which was delivered by our President, Lee Myung-bak, on the occasion of the sixty-fifth anniversary of liberation. This speech was delivered on 15 August, two weeks ago, and I believe that, although this statement is partial, it encapsulates the position of the Republic of Korea on this particular issue, and on reunification issues as well. I quote:

"Today inter-Korean relations demand a new paradigm. It is imperative that the two sides choose coexistence instead of confrontation, progress instead of stagnation. The two of us need to overcome the current state of division and proceed with the call of peaceful reunification. In order to achieve that goal, the two Koreas first need to form a peace community that assures security and peace on the peninsula. What is most important in this connection is the denuclearization of the peninsula. The next step is to carry out comprehensive inter-Korean exchanges and cooperation with a view to developing North Korea's economy dramatically. The result will be an economic community in which the two will work for economic integration. Building on such a foundation, the two Koreas will eventually be able to remove the wall of different systems and establish a community, a Korean nation that will ensure the unity, freedom and the basic rights of all individuals. Through this process we can ultimately bring about the peaceful unification of Korea."

**The President** (*spoke in French*): Thank you, Ambassador Im Han-taek. I would now like to give the floor to Mr. Jazaïry, Ambassador of Algeria.

**Mr. Jazaïry** (Algeria): Mr. President, let me start by saying how proud I am to see you, an eminent African Ambassador, chairing this important body. You have demonstrated over the past years your wisdom, and this wisdom will indeed be necessary in order for you to guide our steps, hopefully towards a positive outcome at the end of your presidency.

I would also like to say how indebted I am to have listened to the eloquent words of the Minister of External Relations of Cameroon, Mr. Henri Eyebe Ayissi, who will no doubt inspire our deliberations. Likewise, I feel indebted to the Mission of Indonesia for having had the privilege of listening to the Deputy Minister for Multilateral Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia.

I would also like to extend a warm welcome to the new Ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and I think his association with our deliberations promises to be extremely inspiring, because I believe that we were all quite impressed by the very thoughtful presentation he made this morning.

Magnus Hellgren and I co-chaired the informal meetings, which were indeed very helpful and fruitful. He is always a source of inspiration for me personally. I think many people around this table have referred to his congenial spirit, and this is what I will retain from his presence here – a very congenial person, a person who is a bridge-builder, who tries to accommodate different views.

We have listened this morning — and our debates are getting more and more interesting — to a whole series of points of view that I thought were what the Conference

on Disarmament should really be about. Of course, we need not only to walk the walk but also to talk the talk, and many States here have walked the walk as well as talked the talk, and indeed the whole atmosphere of the disarmament debate is looking rosier today, broadly speaking, than it has at any time in the recent past. Therefore, we do feel that the Conference on Disarmament should join the fray and not stay back contemplating its navel or looking back to a past that has gone.

The views of my delegation are those of the G-21, and therefore I need not repeat them; but let me say from this morning's discussion that there are two broad views that have been expressed about the predicament in which we are today. Some have put the focus on something being wrong with the Conference on Disarmament proper, not with all those distinguished members round the table that, as many have said, have a lot of wisdom. Something is wrong with the Conference on Disarmament which needs to be fixed. The conclusion is that we need to take a look, get the toolbox out and see how we can bolt the bolts and the screws. Others have said that the problem is not inherent in the machinery itself, but is caused by exogenous factors that have to do with the evolution of international relations in the field of security which creates certain imbalances.

I think that we all need to make a proper assessment of what the nature of the problem is, because, ultimately, we all have a common stake in finding the right solution or helping the emergence of the right solution. If we make the wrong diagnosis, we are going to be chasing a will-o'-the-wisp. So as we look for solutions — perhaps you have realized that in my presentation last time I did put a lot of emphasis on the exogenous aspects, it was not just a question of fixing the rules of procedure or behaving better in the Conference on Disarmament — in a spirit of compromise, I would say let us look at both these issues, and as we look for prescriptions, we need to be aware that the diagnosis is different for different delegates at the meeting. However, as the distinguished representative of South Africa said, whatever the problem, there is a problem, and we cannot stay there indefinitely, lamenting about the problem. We have to do something about it.

This is why the notion of reinvigorating the Conference on Disarmament was not in my delegation's view the most appropriate way of saying it, because it does give the sense that the focus is on something being wrong with the machinery as such. The spirit of the initiative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations is something that my delegation strongly supports. However, we do have some qualms, particularly about the time allocated to heads of State or ministers who have to come from the other side of the world to speak for three to five minutes, which is a bit of a problem.

We also have another problem that I realized this morning as I was reading this very useful document issued on arrangements for the meeting. It is the fact that the ministers or Heads of State can only be accompanied by one person. Now, you know, we do have a stake in contributing as backup for our ministers or Heads of State, but, at the same time, we have some very nice colleagues in New York who might feel that they have a special claim because the meeting is taking place in New York, and this limit to one person is going to be a source of embarrassment for some of us. I would not like to step on the toes of my colleagues in New York, but at the same time, I feel that we each have something that we can contribute to this discussion. Therefore, I would be grateful if the secretariat would kindly look at this issue and show some flexibility, and let us know very quickly whether such flexibility can be exercised.

On the issue of the outcome, of course, there are also some different views, but I would like to say that I was pleased to hear this morning many echoing the position that my delegation expressed at the last plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament, when we said that the outcome might be an SSOD-IV. I think that would be the best opportunity to put everything on the table and to try to provide the kind of impetus that we need for the Conference, because things are tied to one another.

In this regard, as far as the role of the Conference on Disarmament is concerned, I had initially envisaged taking the floor last time in an informal meeting, but it so happened that the discussion started in a plenary meeting, so I felt that we could all contribute, and it was a very interesting discussion.

Two views have been expressed since then in the Conference on Disarmament as to whether we should pursue this discussion in an informal context, or doubly informal context, or just in the Conference itself. I think the answer should not be a dogmatic one. It should be more a question of how much time we have. If we can have a discussion in the Conference on Disarmament, I see merit in that, because at least there is some follow-up, some expression of positions, and we could get some kind of an outcome from the discussion. It makes our job easier, rather than having to draw the outcomes ourselves. I would leave that with you, Mr. President, to see whether there is any objection to using whatever time we have available in the Conference plenary meetings to pursue this discussion on the high-level meeting. If we need more time, by all means, we could continue the discussion in some more informal setting.

Lastly, I find myself very much in agreement with what was said, I think by the Ambassador of Austria and the distinguished representative of Croatia, that we should not consider ourselves an exclusive club, and there would be some benefit in having a positive attitude towards the expansion of the membership of the Conference. This is the position of my delegation on that point, and it is very much as the representative of Croatia said – in line with a desire to promote greater transparency in our deliberations. Therefore, it is very much in the same vein that I would like to say that I would really welcome the follow-up of the initiative that we took last year to get the NGOs to participate more actively in our deliberations. I am always very struck by the inconsistency of some delegations, who in the Human Rights Council are spearheading the participation of NGOs in the debates, and yet seem to be much more reserved here as to their involvement. I think transparency should not be piecemeal. It cannot be isolated. Transparency is a policy for multilateralism and applies to the Human Rights Council as well as to the Conference on Disarmament. If we accept it in the Human Rights Council, we should accept it here. We must be fair and we must be transparent.

With these words, I would like once again to thank you for your patience and to renew to you our deep appreciation for the already enlightening contributions that you have made in the course of this morning's debate.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): It is I who must thank you, Ambassador Jazaïry, for your words of friendship and encouragement. I have also taken note of the proposal that you made. Could I perhaps ask you to submit it to us in written form so that we can consider it together? Clearly, the concerns you raised about the limited number of delegation members who will be admitted to the debating chamber at the High-Level Meeting is an issue on which we must reflect. We will be able to share our views on all these matters with the other distinguished members and ambassadors of the Conference on Disarmament.

I should like to give the floor to the Ambassador of Belarus, Mr. Khvostov.

**Mr. Khvostov** (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): Mr. President, I should of course like to congratulate you on your appointment to the presidency of the Conference and to express support for your efforts in leading the work of this body at this important and final stage of its deliberations. The statement by the Minister of External Relations of Cameroon — the country that you, Mr. President, are representing here — is a shining example of support for the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. President, allow me to present my Government's views concerning this high-level meeting. We see it as an essential step in the resumption of multilateral talks on



disarmament. Judging by the proposed topic, we are touching on the very essence of the multilateral negotiating mechanism for disarmament talks, which crowned the Conference. In our view, you as the current president of the Conference have a key role to play in formulating our intervention to the meeting of 24 September 2010. We believe that the president's address should be balanced and based on the report of the Conference to the General Assembly.

We are grateful to the secretariat for its suggestions as to the meeting's format, especially for extending the time frame and for granting the right to speak to all high-level representatives of participating States.

In our view, last Tuesday's discussion on possible substantive outcomes of the New York meeting was highly informative and useful. We believe that, notwithstanding diverging views on the vision for the meeting's outcome, there are elements that may enjoy sufficiently broad support among member and observer States. Belarus has some proposals regarding the substantive aspects of the president's summary, which I would like to put forward.

First, the relevance of the Conference as the sole disarmament body for negotiation on international security should be emphasized. The Conference has the necessary expertise and potential for conducting negotiation on topical issues on the international disarmament agenda.

Secondly, agreements concerning the work of the Conference that enjoy unanimous support should be given highest priority. This means all documents adopted unanimously by the Conference – such as, programmes of work, the report and mandate of the Conference, and General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. The Conference's links with other disarmament bodies and forums within the framework of the United Nations should be maintained and strengthened.

Thirdly, the capacity of the Conference, the principles underlying its work, and its agenda should be examined at the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Fourthly, the principle of consensus in relation to all Conference decisions ensures that the highest national security interests of member States are taken into account and that the effectiveness and universality of agreements produced by the Conference are safeguarded. Failure to respect this rule or the negotiating process in the Conference's work could undermine the universality of multilateral disarmament agreements.

Fifthly, the Conference is not fulfilling its negotiating functions because of an imbalance in States' interests and differing visions of how to ensure national and regional security. Correcting the situation and seeking international consensus require time and significant efforts, in particular from the permanent members of the Security Council.

Sixthly, the issue of broadening the membership of the Conference should be examined and resolved as soon as the Conference is able to resume its substantive work.

And seventhly and lastly, the involvement of civil society in the work of the Conference, in particular the granting to non-governmental organizations of permanent observer status at the Conference, would enhance the effectiveness of our forum's work and help to improve its accountability before the international community.

I thank you, Mr. President.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): Thank you, Ambassador. Naturally, the Conference will give careful consideration to the proposals by the Government of Belarus regarding the High-Level Meeting in New York.

I should now like to give the floor to the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

*(spoke in English)*

You have the floor, Sir.

**Mr. Ri Jang** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Mr. President, my delegation has asked for the floor to say just a few words to the United States Ambassador and the South Korean delegate as well.

As is well known, until today, the Six-Party Talks remained deadlocked by the barrier of distrust. It is also a hard fact that South Korea stages joint military exercises in league with the United States frequently nowadays.

This abnormal situation proves the urgency of concluding the peace treaty between the parties concerned. The statement of the Ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea proceeded from that point of view. However, the South Korean delegate is saying this or that about the statement delivered by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's Ambassador this morning. The South Korean delegate should be well aware of the foregoing.

In conclusion, as my Ambassador stressed in his statement, the concluding of a peace treaty will help terminate the hostile relations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States and possibly promote the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula at a rapid tempo.

**The President** *(spoke in French)*: I thank the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. I now give the floor to the Ambassador of Bangladesh.

**Mr. Hannan** (Bangladesh): Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. We hope your able leadership will guide us in moving forward the work of the Conference in a positive manner. You can count on our fullest cooperation in discharging your responsibilities.

I would also like to welcome and to express our sincere thanks and appreciation to the foreign minister of Cameroon and to the Deputy Minister for Multilateral Affairs of Indonesia for sharing their wisdom with the Conference on Disarmament. I also extend my delegation's deepest appreciation to the President of Belarus for his sincere efforts in steering the work of the Conference. Let me also welcome the Ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. President, we are happy that you will address, on behalf of the Conference, the high-level meeting in New York on the issue of revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament, to be held on 24 September 2010. Bangladesh considers this high-level meeting as an important opportunity to discuss revitalizing the work of the Conference. We believe that high-level meeting will generate the necessary political impetus the Conference needs more of in order to move forward. Our foreign minister is expected to join the meeting. Bangladesh believes that the Conference will immediately assume its substantive work and make progress toward reaching our ultimate goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world.

In conclusion, I wish Mr. Hellgren of Sweden all the best and success in his future endeavours.

**The President** *(spoke in French)*: I thank you, Ambassador. I give the floor to the distinguished representative of Mexico.

**Ms. Jáquez Huacuja** (Mexico) *(spoke in Spanish)*: I would like to thank the Honourable Minister of External Relations of Cameroon and the Minister for Multilateral Affairs of Indonesia for having shared their thoughts with the Conference.

Since this is the first time that a member of my delegation has taken the floor under the presidency of Cameroon, I should first like to express my delegation's readiness to cooperate with you in your work.

With regard to some of the points raised in the statements of delegations that have spoken today, I think it essential to emphasize the great opportunity to reflect on the situation prevailing in the Conference on Disarmament and in other forums that the High-Level Meeting convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations represents.

I should also like to reiterate that Mexico favours the multilateral route for the conclusion of binding international agreements and that, in this connection, my country has expressed concern that this forum is failing to fulfil its mandate, which is to negotiate multilateral agreements that commit all parties to ensuring a better world while taking national interests into consideration.

However, Mexico does not believe that multilateral efforts, especially those relating to peace and security, should revolve around the interests of one country, or even two or three or four or five countries. Instead, such efforts should promote global agreements that safeguard the interests of the international community as a whole and, ultimately, the security of humanity.

Lastly, I should like to take a minute to extend a few words of farewell to Ambassador Magnus Hellgren, to thank him for his congeniality and friendship and to pay a tribute to his professionalism and dedication. Working with him has been a privilege, not only because of his great personal qualities but also because of the noble aspirations that unite Mexico and Sweden in the pursuit of a nuclear-weapon-free world as members of the New Agenda Coalition, and those that have united us in the past, including our contributions to the work of this forum, for which the ambassadors of our two countries were jointly awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1982.

Thank you, Ambassador Hellgren. We wish you all the best in your future endeavours.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): Thank you, Ms. Jáquez Huacuja, for your brevity. Your statement was brief, and I should like to draw everyone's attention to the time constraints facing us. We ought to be able to conclude at 1 p.m. Our interpreters must also stop working at that time. I would therefore ask you to be brief.

I now give the floor to Mr. Khokher, the representative of Pakistan.

**Mr. Khokher** (Pakistan): Mr. President, I am extremely sorry for taking the floor after my Ambassador's statement. The purpose is not to react to any statement, because I have a lot of regard for Ambassador John Duncan of the United Kingdom and Ambassador Kennedy of the United States, and I will convey the documents, as requested by Ambassador Duncan, to my Ambassador.

However, I will just pick up on one comment concerning the deadlock for the last 20 months. We should not look at the last 20 months; we should look backwards to the last decade and much farther than that, and look beyond into the future for decades to come, not for 20 months down the road. That is one point.

Concerning the information note, we have noted this information, but need just one clarification. At one point it says that the President of the Conference on Disarmament will make a statement, and later that a summary will be prepared on the main points after the statements by Member States and heads of organizations. If a statement is to be delivered by the President of the Conference on Disarmament, we look forward to receiving a draft version so that we can finalize it before the commencement of the meeting.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): I give the floor to the distinguished representative of India.

**Mr. Singh Gill** (India): Mr. President, my delegation is delighted to see you, from a fellow G-21 country, chair our meeting today, and we extend to you our full cooperation, especially on the four priority items of our work that you identified earlier this morning. We also thank the distinguished foreign minister of Cameroon for sharing his insights with us today. We also appreciate the presence of other dignitaries, including the Deputy Minister for Multilateral Affairs of Indonesia.

I would also like to join other delegates in extending a welcome to the Ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and to wish Mr. Hellgren of Sweden all the best as he embarks on his sabbatical.

We look forward to an opportunity to discuss further arrangements for and the substance of the high-level meeting. We are grateful for the information note received today. My delegation had the opportunity to share some thoughts at the last plenary meeting, and we would go into some detail, in terms of substance, at the next available opportunity. You have plenty of options as per Conference practice, and we look forward to an opportunity to discuss this important subject.

I would like the record of today's discussions to note that my delegation rejects the assumptions, illusions and innuendos contained in a statement that we have heard today. For a long time we have maintained that the Conference on Disarmament is not the right forum for raising bilateral and regional issues, and therefore I would not like to go into the details of why we reject this thesis. We can do so at the appropriate time, but the record of this meeting should reflect that we do not accept that thesis. Our priority is to work on the priority issues of the multilateral disarmament agenda. So instead of diverting attention from that, we should all work together to advance this common multilateral disarmament agenda, which should contribute to peace and security and benefit our people.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): Allow me to convey my thanks to the distinguished representative of India and, in particular, my thanks for the brevity of your statement. I now give the floor to the last speaker, who, I believe, is the Republic of Korea.

**Mr. Kam Woon-an** (Republic of Korea): Mr. President, I am sorry to take the floor. However, since it is my first time taking the floor, I would like to convey my congratulations to you, and I will keep my statement very short, so as not to make you angry for being hungry.

The delegation of the Republic of Korea would not like to turn this multilateral negotiating forum into a bilateral quarrel field, but even so, I have to point out some problems expressed by my comrade from the delegation of North Korea.

The first thing is that the joint military exercise was caused by the threat of North Korea, and it is an annual exercise. The second thing is that the denuclearization of North Korea and resumption of the Six-Party Talks was requested by the NPT Review Conference, which indicates that it is the wish of the international community.

I would like to talk to the North Korean delegation before talking about the peace treaty between the United States and North Korea. We would like to recommend that they return to the Six-Party Talks and denuclearize.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): I thank the representative of the Republic of Korea. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has already exercised its right of reply. To conclude today's meeting, which must end at 1 p.m., I should like to give the floor to the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament.

**Mr. Ordzhonikidze** (Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations): Thank you, Mr. President.

In fact, I have appealed to you several times, as you will remember, over many years, to keep your regional conflicts outside the Conference on Disarmament. You know all the pertinent forums for the discussion and solution of that regional conflict. I have appealed to you, several times, that, rather than engaging in the bilateral exchange of who is right and who is wrong, on where the regional conflict situation is at, you should concentrate on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. It will serve you well, and it will serve the Conference on Disarmament well.

As to the information note concerning the 24 September meeting, it is very self-explanatory, and if I remember correctly, there were several questions on the document.

One question was asked by the Ambassador of Pakistan – whether the summary will be binding. Well, I can hardly remember any summary taking the form of a binding document, although, of course, if a delegation at the United Nations General Assembly makes a proposal to make this summary binding, and that proposal is supported by the majority of Member States, then it can become binding. So this is a very, I would say, hypothetical way of making the summary binding; although that possibility exists.

Of course, our President will make a speech, and I would like to remind you that it will not be our permanent representative here in Geneva. It will be the President of Cameroon, as far as I know. If the President of Cameroon finds it necessary to agree to that speech, which will, I believe, be more factual because we do not have much in our report — it will be aligned with the report — then he would probably contact his counterpart as to the content of the speech. That is what I think. Correct me if I am wrong.

If there are no further questions concerning this meeting, then I believe the meeting is on. We can wholeheartedly — this time unanimously, I did not hear any views to the contrary — inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations that there is unanimous support for his meeting.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): Thank you, Secretary-General. It is now 12.55 p.m. I see that one more delegation is asking to take the floor. We have two minutes.

**Mr. Ri Jang Gon** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Mr. President, I am awfully sorry to interrupt you, but I have just one word to say to the South Korean delegate again. My delegation categorically rejects the observation made by the South Korean delegate just a little earlier. What the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea said is based on facts. I take this opportunity to urge the South Korean authorities not to follow the policy of others.

**The President** (*spoke in French*): I thank the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. I give the floor to the representative of Pakistan. Please be brief.

**Mr. Khokher** (Pakistan): Mr. President, I will be very brief, just to make the comment that we do not need to say that there is unanimous support in the Conference on Disarmament. I think we do not need to report that to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Every member State will have the opportunity to express its views. So let us leave it that way.

**The President**: I thank you. Thank you for being brief.

It is I who must thank the distinguished representative of Pakistan. I believe that there is no fundamental contradiction between what you say and what the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament has said. He himself has said: "no objection".

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, ambassadors and distinguished representatives of the States assembled here at the Conference on Disarmament.

The next plenary meeting will be held on Tuesday, 7 September, at 10 a.m. in this Chamber.

Thank you and, above all, bon appétit.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*