

# CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.994  
1 September 2005

ENGLISH

---

## FINAL RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FOURTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Thursday, 1 September 2005, at 10.20 a.m.

President: Mr. Manuel RODRIGUEZ-CUADROS (Peru)

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I call to order the 994th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

We begin this meeting in the context of two sensitive situations, which have caused dozens of deaths, hundreds of deaths and thousands of other victims in two countries of the international community. I refer firstly to the damage caused by hurricane Katrina in the United States, particularly in New Orleans and Louisiana, as well as the tragic events which occurred in Iraq, causing more than 900 deaths. On my own behalf and on behalf of the Conference on Disarmament I should like to express our deepest condolences to the United States and the Government of Iraq and to the families of the victims.

I would ask the Conference on Disarmament to join me in observing one minute of silence to honour the memory of the victims and show solidarity with members of their families.

\* \* \*

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): As we begin this session of the Conference on Disarmament, I wish first to welcome our colleague, Ambassador Johannes Landman, the new representative of the Netherlands to the Conference on Disarmament. We are all aware of his personal qualities and his professional career; at the same time we greatly appreciate the constant and recent contributions made by the Netherlands to the pursuit of the work of the Conference on Disarmament. Welcome, Ambassador Landman.

At the same time I would like to inform delegates that this meeting is being observed by young people from the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme for the year 2005. I am sure that the presence of these young people will stimulate their concern for matters relating to peace and international security. We welcome them too to this meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

In accordance with the practice and tradition of the Conference, as Peru takes the Chair, I should like before continuing with the agenda for today to make a statement on Peru's view from the Chair of our work and the immediate future of our discussions.

The international situation in the field of peace and security remains characterized by instability, challenge and ambivalence. Some hotspots of conflict are beginning to see progress in a favourable direction. This is the case in the Middle East. The firm decision by the Government of Israel to successfully bring about the withdrawal of the settlements in the Gaza Strip, including some in the West Bank, as well as the constructive attitude adopted by the Palestinian National Authority throughout this process, independently of certain acts of violence which must be condemned, point to a clear possibility for peace negotiations being resumed in the context of the "road map". This is a positive trend.

(The President)

At the same time, the terrorist attacks in the United Kingdom have brought home once again to the world's peaceful and democratic conscience that one-sided conflict continues to be a cause of serious instability for international peace and security. Likewise, issues relating to the difficult task of monitoring nuclear proliferation remind us that the crucial issue of weapons of mass destruction constitutes the main challenge to peace and international stability at the present time. The outcome of the Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was undeniably frustrating. The fact that it was not even possible to produce positive consensual recommendations is not the best signal. These clearly are negative trends, events and factors.

Taken together, all these events have occurred and are occurring in the context of the process of institutional reform of the United Nations and preparations for the major decisions to be taken by the heads of State and government of our countries in a few weeks' time in New York at the high-level plenary meeting of the General Assembly, including decisions relating to disarmament, peace, international security and, possibly, the immediate future of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral forum for the negotiation of binding legal instruments.

The development of the Conference's work must necessarily, in my view, be evaluated within this general process, and also in relation to the various different national perceptions of security that many States, especially those most concerned with nuclear disarmament, still uphold in markedly singular terms and approaches. This of course has had an impact on the huge difficulties being encountered in building shared visions of nuclear disarmament and international security, even within the regional groups themselves. I think that this is no accident, nor is it exclusively due to a lack of political will or to limitations in the methods and procedures which are used in the Conference. There is also a divergence of basic interests which must be recognized. And it is no surprise if we still find ourselves in an international system of transition, particularly on specific aspects of the world's peace and security.

Accordingly, it is also not at all surprising that a repeated failure to act should have marked the work of the Conference on Disarmament over the last nine years. If we do not manage to unblock the opposing perceptions which make it impossible to establish a programme of work in the next 18 months, a whole decade will have been lost for multilateral negotiation on disarmament. But this hypothesis should not lead us into error and to the perception that the scope for reactivating the Conference and thus restoring its negotiating capacity is exhausted.

On 26 January 1999, the Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, was here in this room. In his message he made an austere but significant assessment of the contribution made by the Conference on Disarmament to the quest for a world free of the threat of weapons of mass destruction - the negotiation and signing of the Chemical Weapons Convention in 1992 and the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty in 1996. On that occasion, the Secretary-General wondered whether having concluded two multilateral treaties of such scope and importance in 20 years of work by the Conference could be perceived from another angle by some critics as, and I quote the Secretary-General, a "meagre harvest". His reply was an emphatic "no". He pointed out that multilateral disarmament negotiations are complex, difficult and take a long time to mature. The Secretary-General specifically said on that occasion that there is always a "pre-negotiating" stage, in which some shared understanding is reached that a security problem

(The President)

exists, that it has certain dimensions, that it is of interest to everyone and that it must be addressed multilaterally. This process may be arduous and time-consuming, but without it there is no guarantee that the end product will be universal and effective.

The Secretary-General was certainly thus referring, in this room in 1999, to what might be called negotiations on the terms of negotiations. And that has been the context in which the Conference on Disarmament has been operating over the past nine years. Total failure to act would have been worse. And clearly, the lesson which I think we must learn from the excessive and sometimes frustrating prolongation of this phase of negotiations on negotiations certainly cannot be that we should abandon the process and, for example, have recourse to a formula such as putting the Conference into recess. No - the commitment which our Governments made when we set up the Conference on Disarmament could not be interpreted, even under a strict legal approach, in terms of abandoning its task, but rather of assuming a critical and reflective attitude with a view to redoubling efforts to unblock the process and come up with a programme of work on the basis of a compromise which we could call constructive and responsible realism.

During the current session some movement has taken place which, however isolated and perhaps low-profile it may have been, is still highly significant and positive. Firstly, for many years the Conference has not been attended by so many ministers of foreign affairs as this year. Secondly, important groups of industrialized and developing countries have referred with concern to the Conference on Disarmament at meetings at the highest level. And we cannot ignore the fact that it is a subject on the agenda both at the summit to be held in the United Nations General Assembly in a few weeks' time and throughout the process of United Nations reform.

But there is something which is even more important and which relates to the very dynamics of the Conference. Firstly, the initiative presented by Ambassador Chris Sanders, the "food for thought" document, which puts forward interesting procedural and substantive proposals with the aim of breaking the current impasse. And also the initiative by Ambassador Wegger Strømmen of Norway, which enabled four formal meetings to be held on each of the four items identified as matters of priority: nuclear disarmament, fissile material, negative security assurances and the arms race in outer space. These two courses of action have, in the President's view, had the virtue of overcoming stagnation and continuing to place on the table both a range of solutions and areas of discussion which make it possible better to identify the ideas and positions of different States and the probable existence of room for dialogue and negotiation with a view to convergence. However, we cannot fail to recognize, in the context of the constructive realism to which I have referred, that despite the value of the "food for thought" document, it did not in the end achieve consensus.

Accordingly, reason and intelligence in negotiation advise us, indicate to us, that it is a document which constitutes a substantive reference, like the five Ambassadors' paper, but that at the same time the possibility of consensus must be built on a text which, while keeping and gathering the substantive elements from those documents, makes new contributions with a view to reconciling positions and promoting points of convergence.

(The President)

During Peru's term of office, apart from the important and essential work of preparing, adopting and submitting the report of the Conference to the United Nations General Assembly, it is my intention to continue the informal consultations with a view to the possible submission of a document which continues the search for consensus. For this purpose, Peru intends to work in very close coordination with Ambassador Zdzisław Rapacki of Poland, who will be in the Chair from January. In the current circumstances, which are difficult for the Conference's credibility, it is vital to confer greater continuity on the rationality and impetus of the President in the search for a consensus solution. Accordingly, I think that work in close coordination with the next President can introduce that systematic factor of continuity in practice. At the same time, we shall be favouring consultations with all the Presidents who have been in office during the current session with a view to furnishing a basis of greater support not only for the remaining consultations with all the members of the Conference, but also for the development of possible texts which might promote a process of convergence.

I am going to say something which may be a tautology, but sometimes things which are obvious can act as a sort of call for attention to things which are obvious but in certain circumstances may be ignored. The Conference on Disarmament is a negotiating body. It is the only body with the capacity to negotiate disarmament treaties in the United Nations system. I therefore believe that it is vital for us to manage in the best possible way the principles and norms of negotiation throughout our discussions and our work. There will be no possibility of removing the deadlock if a minimum of concessions which are mutually acceptable to all parties are not generated. And particularly if it is not borne in mind that, as a complement to the legitimate exercise of national foreign policies on disarmament, even on the very items on the Conference's agenda, there is, as a complement, a greater interest which brings us together, which has to do with the *raison d'être* of the United Nations and which can only be obtained multilaterally, that is, adding to the national foreign policy actions of each State the immense added value of multilateral agreement, the commitment and obligations for all arising from international agreements.

I recall a phrase which I read in the records of the Conference some years ago. They were the words of Mr. John Holum, at that time the Acting Under-Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Affairs of the United States. At the 809th plenary meeting of the Conference, Mr. Holum said that in order to achieve disarmament agreements, "as with any negotiations, we must be realistic and aim for what can be achieved".

During its term of office Peru will favour consultations on the basis of its conviction that all States represented here can certainly seek an agreement based on constructive and responsible realism. In order to do that, we must use all available tools, including the possibility, if necessary, of holding next year, for example, a meeting of the Conference at foreign minister level. A compromise solution is essential. A reaffirmation of political will is essential. Let us work in that perspective, drawing on acquired experience. Ultimately, what is at stake, above and beyond the programme of work, is the future viability, in the context of reform of the United Nations, of the Conference on Disarmament, its renewed and strengthened existence as the sole existing forum for the negotiation of treaties in the crucial area of disarmament related to international peace and security.

(The President)

These are the ideas which I wanted to put forward for your consideration on taking the Chair of the Conference.

There are a few colleagues on the list of speakers. I call first on the representative of Italy.

Mr. TREZZA (Italy): Mr. President, let me start by joining you in expressing our condolences to our colleagues from Iraq and the United States for the tragedy at Al-A'Imma bridge in Baghdad and for the victims and damage caused by hurricane Katrina.

Let me also welcome the presence of the disarmament fellows and wish them a productive programme of studies. Let me also welcome Ambassador Landman of the Netherlands.

Mr. President, since this is your first appearance at the Conference on Disarmament, both as the new Permanent Representative of Peru and as the President of the Conference, I wish to welcome you with redoubled warmth. Two years ago I found myself in a similar situation since I, too, had to exercise the presidency of the CD from the very first day of my arrival in Geneva. I wish you success in your task. Your impressive curriculum and the fact that you have held until very recently the position of Foreign Minister of Peru adds prestige and authority to your country, to the presidency and to the CD itself. Let me also express my appreciation for your inspiring inaugural statement and highlight convergence with what I am about to say.

One of the tasks to be accomplished at this time of the year is the drafting of the yearly report of the CD to the General Assembly. It should not be a routine. It is important to accurately report to the United Nations General Assembly, which is the institution which established the CD, on what has been accomplished during this year.

Was it a "blank year"? The answer would be yes if we measure accomplishments in terms of the effective negotiations achieved by a body whose main task is to negotiate agreements in the area of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation. The answer would also be yes if success were gauged in terms of finding compromises on a possible programme of work.

But we have to be more nuanced and examine the evolution in the CD in the light of the present international conjuncture. The difficulty in reaching substantial results is not only a prerogative of this Conference. We have witnessed the difficulties of reaching a consensus of substance in May at the NPT Conference, which after all was a regular review of an existing treaty. We should not feel too discouraged if we find ourselves stalled in an exercise which is more ambitious, since its aim is to legislate (*de jure condendo*) new international - possibly legally binding - instruments in areas which are of direct consequence for international peace and security. Given the diverging priorities in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation today, we can hardly be surprised if we do not find a compromise. In this context I wish to quote from a statement you made, Mr. President, in your capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs of your country on 15 March of this year at the CD.

(Mr. Trezza, Italy)

(continued in Spanish)

“We find ourselves in a situation of some uncertainty in which instability is gaining ground over peace and new threats are posing challenges, testing the creativity and political determination of our governments to avoid the collapse of the Conference on Disarmament.”

(continued in English)

The effective difficulties of making progress at the CD at this stage should be mentioned to the General Assembly not as a justification but as a challenge that we are ready to confront together with our resolve to overcome it. We should also indicate that those difficulties are not unique to our Conference but reflect a wider general situation.

We also suggest that the concept, widely expressed during our debates, that a solution to our problems is also a matter of political will - and therefore deserves to be addressed at a political level - be contemplated in our report. Like last year, we should welcome the addresses made to the CD by dignitaries at cabinet level as well as the high-level declarations made this year regarding the CD. The presence of dignitaries and these declarations were expressions of attention and support for the endeavours of the Conference. They were more numerous than in the past year, and their impact has been of high value.

It would be appreciated if we could also report that new significant efforts have been made this year to find an understanding on a programme of work. These efforts have been aimed at further “distilling” the issues which are to be negotiated or dealt with at the Conference. In Italy’s view, these efforts have been aimed at reflecting more closely and more realistically the present international situation in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation.

We would appreciate it if the report could underscore that the Conference held a constructive and vigorous thematic debate on the “core issues” of our agenda, with the active participation of many delegations. We believe that these formal thematic sessions have given us the updated positions of member States. As you know, we stand ready to continue such a debate in a form that is more suitable to other members. We take this opportunity to thank the secretariat for the timely and very useful circulation of the records of those debates.

We would also appreciate it if the report were to state that all the Presidents who have succeeded each other this year have made their best efforts to revitalize the Conference. These efforts should be maintained even after the conclusion of the presidencies, which - as I have already said in the past - are too short and too ephemeral. This is why we support strengthening the role of presidencies, especially in periods in which subsidiary bodies are not in place.

Finally, we believe that the Conference cannot work in a vacuum and that the CD has to be in tune with issues and developments which are relevant to the current international security environment. As you did today, Mr. President, delegations should therefore be free to raise those issues. This concept, too, should be reiterated in our report.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Thank you very much for your statement. I am convinced that your initiatives for the incorporation of substantive elements of our work in the report to the General Assembly will be the subject of positive dialogue and keen interest in the Conference.

I call on the representative of the Netherlands. Ambassador Landman, you have the floor.

Mr. LANDMAN (Netherlands): Mr. President, it would be presumptuous if I made a statement of substance on this occasion, my first day here. It would be presumptuous, particularly after the rich contribution you made yourself on this occasion and what we have just heard from our colleague, Carlo Trezza.

Allow me just a few personal words. First of all, I would like to align myself totally with what you have said yourself, and also Ambassador Trezza, on the tragedies which have just occurred. I would also like to wish you all success in your new function as President of the group, of this historically important body, which has a rich past and we trust still has a meaningful future.

Now as regards some personal remarks, when I was a student, I was asked by an American visiting professor at the university where I studied, in Utrecht, to write a paper on a near-war that broke out in 1902 between Germany and the United States on the Samoa Islands, and as a main source of information, she referred to an edition of the letters of Theodore Roosevelt. It was seven volumes, which had just been published, and there was a lot of interesting material relevant to that subject.

Theodore Roosevelt, as some may know, won the Nobel Peace Prize because he was, together with the Tsar of Russia, an initiator of the first disarmament negotiations modern Europe knew. That was on naval power, naval power being considered the biggest threat to peace at the time.

In going through these volumes, I found a very interesting letter where he wrote to a friend of his, Senator Cabot Lodge, that he was very happy with the successful - partly successful - outcome of these negotiations, because they agreed indeed to reduce quite a substantive amount of tonnage. Tonnage was the criterion at the time, apparently, of these ships, these naval ships, gunboats. And he said, I am so happy with it because this untreatable Congress which has all the time refused to modernize the navy cannot get around it now. We have to put this all into the dustbin, where it will find its proper place, and at last we will have a flexible, modern navy.

Now this letter has always remained in my head, and that was one of the reasons at the time at the end of the 1960s and the early 1970s, when General de Gaulle, for instance, did not want to participate in disarmament negotiations. I had some understanding for that, and when my Government decided to make me part of our delegation to the negotiations on conventional armed forces in Europe in Vienna, I was also rather sceptical that I was doing or going to do something meaningful.



(Mr. Landman, Netherlands)

Well, I can reassure you in that sense that I had in the end the impression that we did something meaningful, that at the Vienna negotiations we reached agreement in a record time of two years on, for instance, the destruction of more tanks than were destroyed during the Second World War. One should not imagine that all this military equipment would have been around, still, in what hands. I still remember as one of the most emotional moments in my diplomatic career, when this treaty was initialled in 1990, and there was a press conference, with the Russian Ambassador and chief negotiator together with the American Ambassador and chief negotiator, where the Russian Ambassador said that this was not only an extremely meaningful and important treaty and agreement but also it symbolized the victory of civil society over the military society.

So there are many implications in arms control, and indeed, I can only align myself with your desire and your intention to provide life again to this body, and I can assure you that you will have all the support of the Netherlands in doing so.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Thank you very much, Ambassador, for your statement. I think that you have given us a vision of confidence in what we can do. The representative of Algeria, Ambassador Jazairy, has the floor.

Mr. JAZAIRY (Algeria): Mr. President, of course I would like first to join my colleagues and your good self in expressing our condolences to the Governments of Iraq and the United States. I would also like to extend to you our warm congratulations on your accession to your high office. As my distinguished colleague from Italy has just said, you are indeed highly qualified to take up this responsibility.

What I will do is probably make a few off-the-cuff comments on the debate that has gone on so far, rather than read a written statement. I would also like to join in extending a warm welcome to the distinguished Ambassador of the Netherlands, and judging by the statement he has just made, we very much look forward to listening to him in the future very often.

Let me say first that, as also my colleague from Italy has underlined, the presidency is really exercised for too short and too ephemeral a period. You also mentioned the question of the need for greater continuity in the action of the presidency. This you are trying to address now by establishing this coordination with the former and the incoming President, and I think that is a good thing. But the issue of having a longer term for the office of President would make sense, if only to benefit from the acquired accumulated wisdom of the very high-level and competent officials that have access to this position. So I would welcome a possibility to discuss this issue informally in the future.

In your presentation, Mr. President, you have, as is traditional, made some comments on the upsides and the downsides of the present political situation, and although this is not at the centre of the debate of the Conference on Disarmament, I would venture to make some passing comment on the upsides and with respect to the Middle East. I probably would not characterize the situation exactly as you have, though the thrust I would share. What we would hope is that the withdrawal of the Israeli occupation from Gaza would be - and this is what I would

(Mr. Jazairy, Algeria)

emphasize - would have to be a first step in the implementation of the “road map”. If it is, then it is good news. If it is not, then it is an open question as to what the consequences would be, especially as there have been a much larger number of settlers that have moved into the West Bank during the past year than the total number of settlers that withdrew from Gaza. You also referred to the positive attitude of the Palestinian entity in your statement, “in spite of acts of violence which took place”. I would like to emphasize that acts of violence have taken place recently on both sides, and that therefore this is not attributable to one side. There are some specific occurrences which took place only a few weeks ago which are still in everybody’s mind.

I thought it was particularly important that you would stress that the problem of the Conference on Disarmament is not a problem of methodology. I have seen in a report that is being prepared for the General Assembly that it is because of the issue of methodology of procedure that we are stuck with these issues of disarmament and the absence of progress on the NPT. It is not a question of procedure. It is a question of substance, as you rightly say.

I think therefore that there is a lot of sense in the necessity at some stage to try to focus on the issues which need to be grappled with, probably at a high level, as both you and the Ambassador of Italy have just mentioned. It is true, and I would say that the glass is half-full in terms of our performance for last year’s Conference on Disarmament. I think that in recent years, although there have been the obvious political difficulties that you have mentioned, the proposal of the five Ambassadors - and of course I may be preaching from my own parish because Algeria was one of those Ambassadors - and also the proposal of Ambassador Sanders, the “food for thought” and the Norwegian way of organizing the discussions have been positive aspects, and I think that all these elements put together could, beyond the factual report that we have to submit as the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly, try and bring together some of the key issues that are of a highly political nature and perhaps not waiting until the Conference on Disarmament at foreign minister level next year that you have suggested, and that we would welcome. Would it not be possible, as we have all these leaders from our different countries in New York in September, to get them into a sort of planetary bargain? They will be discussing all sorts of things. Would it not be possible for them to sprinkle in some of those issues as well? - if only because, as we look for a solution, the compromise might be broader than just the ambit of the Conference on Disarmament, and this is what heads of State can discuss when they meet. They are not tied by the mandate of the Conference on Disarmament. They can try and see if they can have a broader planetary bargain.

These are in summary the elements, the comments, that I wanted to make, and I thank you very much for your inspiring presentation.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Thank you very much, Ambassador. Firstly, I am thanking the representative of Algeria for his statement. I reiterate my appreciation for his comments and his thoughts. The representative of Israel has asked for the floor. He has the floor.

Mr. LEVANON (Israel) (translated from Spanish): I, too, would like to add my voice and congratulate you, Mr. President, on taking the Chair, and also to join in extending condolences to the Government of the United States and regarding what took place in Iraq.

I was not due to take the floor this morning, but my colleague who introduced politics into this forum, which is a purely professional one, has compelled me to say that it would have been preferable for the distinguished Ambassador of Algeria to back up what he said by saying that the step taken by Israel in leaving Gaza was a very bold step and, as senior leaders throughout the world have said, a historic one. And for that reason I would like to thank you for your comments at the start of this meeting.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Thank you very much for your statement, Ambassador Levanon. The delegation of the United States.

Mr. CYNKIN (United States of America): Mr. President, I just wanted, in addition to welcoming you both to Geneva and to the presidency, to express my very heartfelt thanks to you and to others who have expressed sympathy for the victims, and also I can assure you on a personal level that I found it very touching and moving that you chose to begin your presidency in such a very gracious manner.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Thank you very much, Mr. Cynkin. I think that all the Chair did was to interpret the feelings of all delegations.

I have no other speakers on the list. If that is the case, we will continue with the other items on the agenda.

With regard to the report that the President is to submit to the General Assembly, the secretariat has prepared a timetable of work that I would like to bring to the attention of the Conference. The timetable of meetings for next week should include two plenary meetings. However, the secretariat has informed me that Thursday, 8 September, is an official United Nations holiday and that, as a result, the Palais des Nations will be closed. Therefore I would like to propose that next week, unless there are views to the contrary, the Conference should hold only one plenary meeting, on Tuesday, 6 September. I am consulting you on that proposal. I understand that we are in agreement, and therefore it is so decided.

We will have four weeks for work up to the date of the end of the present session. We will devote part of these four weeks to consideration of the annual report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly. Rule 44 of the Conference's rules of procedure provides that the draft report shall be made available to all members of the Conference at least two weeks before the scheduled date for its adoption. With the assistance of the secretariat, work has already begun on the preparation of the draft report. We will be taking into account the views expressed during this meeting. The idea would be to make available to all delegations, in all official languages, the first draft of the report on Wednesday, 7 September, so that delegations will have a week to review the text. And we would have an initial informal meeting to go

(The President)

through a joint reading of the draft report immediately after the plenary meeting on Thursday, 15 September. I think that with that scheduling we will be able to look at the text calmly, and we will be able to depict the present session as accurately as possible.

I would like to inform you of the following. For reasons relating to the office of the Minister for Foreign Affairs that I held until just over a week ago in my country, I will have to be away for a rather considerable period during September. And in order to ensure that the Chair is occupied at the highest level of representation and with the greatest possible effectiveness, my Government has accredited on an ad hoc basis for this session, within the delegation of Peru, Ambassador Félix Calderón, who is here on my right. He is currently the Ambassador of Peru to South Africa and one of the most outstanding experts in the Peruvian Foreign Ministry on disarmament matters. Whenever I am absent, Ambassador Calderón will take the Chair, and I am sure that his capabilities are such that our work, the dialogue and consultations, will proceed in keeping with the expectations we all have for this last phase of our session.

If we have no additional statements, we will declare this meeting closed, but not before I have thanked you for coming, and in particular the delegations that have taken the floor and made such positive references to Peru in the role of President. My thanks to them and to you. The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 11.20 a.m.