

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.455
7 April 1988

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIFTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 7 April 1988, at 10 a.m.

President:

Mr. David Meiszter

(Hungary)

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 455th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

In conformity with its programme of work, the Conference continues consideration of agenda item 8, entitled "Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament". In accordance with rule 30 of the rules of procedure, however, any member who wishes to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of: Algeria, India and the United Kingdom. I now give the floor to the first speaker on my list, the representative of Algeria, Ambassador Hacene.

Mr. HACENE (Algeria) (translated from French): Mr. President, first of all I should like to say how pleased my delegation is to see you presiding over the Conference. The devotion of your country to the cause of disarmament and your own well-known skills will, I am sure, offer a firm guarantee that our work will be successfully guided during the month of particularly hard work that is beginning. I should also like to extend our sincere thanks to your predecessors, Ambassadors Rose and von Stülpnagel, who with exemplary devotion gave the Conference the benefit of their rich experience and abilities as skilful diplomats. I should also like to welcome our new colleagues, Ambassadors Azikiwe from Nigeria, de Azambuja from Brazil, Elaraby from Egypt, Marchand from Canada, Nasserri from Iran, Solesby from the United Kingdom and Sujka from Poland. They may be assured of the full co-operation of the Algerian delegation. Finally I should like to join in the unanimous tribute paid to the memory of Ambassador Ian Cromartie, whom we will remember as a man of skill and conviction.

It has become a commonplace to say that the present session of the Conference is being held in an international context which is both promising and crucial. The international situation, promising because of the current momentum in negotiations between the two greatest Powers in the world, is at the same time influenced by two important dates as regards disarmament, to wit the holding of the third special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament and the forthcoming summit meeting between the President of the United States of America and the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We would express the hope that the conjunction of these two events will augur well for the complementarity which has been so eagerly awaited between the bilateral negotiations and the multilateral negotiations on disarmament.

The conclusion of the Washington agreement on the elimination of short-range and intermediate range missiles in Europe is a measure which merits particular emphasis.

In his message of congratulations to Messrs. Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, President Chadli Bendjedid welcomed this important event in international relations as an act of historic dimensions and a first step which calls for further determined measures.

(Mr. Hacene, Algeria)

Even if it covers only a limited part of the nuclear arsenals of the two super-Powers, the Washington agreement draws its importance from the fact that it is the first real nuclear disarmament agreement. It is encouraging to note in this connection that in their negotiations in the field of disarmament the two parties are no longer satisfied, as they were in the past, with simple limitations which were, regrettably, frequently followed by new arms race in various forms.

All the appropriate lessons should be drawn from past experience to broaden and deepen this movement which has been started thanks to the Washington agreement. In order for it to be lasting, the scope of this agreement should certainly lead to a slipstream effect in negotiating the items on the agenda of the bilateral and multilateral talks.

To return to the initial truth that international peace and security are indivisible, it is essential for the improvement of relations between the two super-Powers and between the two major military alliances in the world to have positive repercussions for the international community as a whole, thus enshrining the equal right of all States to security.

Unless we wish to repeat the errors of the past, there would be no point in trying to build a state of lasting security which was limited to a specific region and resulted in the transfer of arms to other regions or turned these other regions into outlets for tension. No matter how meritorious it might be, the regional approach cannot exclude an overall approach, which is necessary for the establishment of genuine global security.

Among the items before the forthcoming special session will be consideration of the report to be submitted to it by the Conference. This will offer the international community a special opportunity to evaluate the work done by our Conference since SSOD-II, and more generally since the adoption of the Final Document of SSOD-I. The short version of the evaluation is clear, because the Conference has been unable to reach any agreement on the items on its agenda. Worse yet - negotiations on nuclear disarmament questions, to which the Final Document of SSOD-I assigned to priority, still remain to be started.

We do not seek here to assign responsibility for this deadlock, nor necessarily to outline the reasons for this situation, whether they are related to the international context since the end of the 1970s or to other phenomena. The question we feel needs to be asked has more to do with the way in which the Conference can move beyond the present deadlock and go against the trend which has seen it become more and more marginal.

If attempts have been made to date to present this state of affairs as the inevitable result of an unfavourable international environment, we are now entitled to expect in return that the current momentum in Soviet-American negotiations could also be reflected within the multilateral bodies dealing with disarmament issues.

Here is a clear opportunity to translate into concrete terms the indispensable complementarity between multilateral and bilateral disarmament negotiations.

(Mr. Hacene, Algeria)

The forthcoming special session of the General Assembly on disarmament should serve to give impetus to the future work of the Conference and to seek practical ways of realizing this objective, starting from the joint achievement represented by the consensus on the adoption of the Final Document of SSOD-I. Despite differing views which might subsist between countries, we must recognize that the deadlock in the multilateral negotiation process can only be prejudicial to all of us in the long run.

The priority items on the agenda of the Conference quite rightly include the question of a nuclear test ban. Above and beyond its practical scope, set out inter alia in the Final Document of SSOD-I, this question will in the end serve as a real test for the realization of any nuclear disarmament process, whether bilateral or multilateral. There is no need to describe the deadlock here on this question, but it is important to note that this situation indicates first and foremost the gap between the acknowledged calling of the Conference and its operation in practice.

Discussions are currently under way at various levels between the USSR and the United States in an attempt to limit nuclear tests, following a step-by-step approach. Clearly, we cannot but support any activities that even slightly bring together the positions of the two parties on a question as vital as that of banning nuclear tests. These activities, no matter how useful, cannot however be a substitute for the conclusion of a multilateral treaty providing for a complete ban on nuclear tests, nor can they compensate for the absence of negotiations on such an agreement within the Conference.

By the same token, the special responsibility that the two super-Powers are seen to bear in nuclear disarmament cannot rule out the legitimate participation of all countries in negotiations on this question, which by its nature involves the security and the very existence of all mankind.

By virtue of its membership and its mandate, the Conference on Disarmament is an irreplaceable framework for multilateral negotiations under item 2.

We regret in this connection that the draft mandate presented by the Group of 21 in document CD/819 was not supported by all the members of the Conference. The absence of agreement on the draft mandate in the above-mentioned document is of concern primarily because it seems to reflect a denial of the right of the Conference to start negotiations on nuclear disarmament. We none the less continue to hope that the situation will evolve in the near future, in particular with the prospect of an agreement between the USSR and the United States on a 50 per cent reduction in their strategic weapons.

Another question which deserves greater attention from the Conference relates to the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Despite the acknowledged urgency of this issue, we are obliged to note that our consideration of this matter still falls far short of the expectations of the international community. The difficulties encountered in attempts to improve the mandate of the Ad hoc Committee on Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space are significant in this regard.

(Mr. Hacene, Algeria)

The adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of resolution 42/33, and the commitments, limited though they are, assumed by the American and Soviet sides in their joint statement in Washington, should normally have led the Conference to embark on genuine negotiations under item 5 of the agenda. We none the less hope that the Ad hoc Committee dealing with this item will use this present session to take a concrete and more specific look at the various questions on its work programme. We know that the Conference can count on the devotion and the skills of the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee, Ambassador Taylardat, to ensure the greatest possible progress in the work of this body.

The negotiations on the banning of chemical weapons offer cause for satisfaction, and to a certain extent compensate for the frustration that we might feel at the deadlock in the other items on the agenda of the Conference. Thanks to the tireless efforts of Ambassador Ekéus and Ambassador Sujka as chairmen of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, important progress has been made in drafting a convention banning such weapons. It is true that the pace of the negotiations on this question could have been faster, but we continue to hope that our Conference will shoulder all its responsibilities so as to respond to the unanimous appeal addressed to it by the United Nations General Assembly to move as rapidly as possible towards the elaboration of the convention.

As we move closer to completing the draft convention, it is extremely important for all parties involved in the negotiations to focus their efforts on concluding an agreement which genuinely deals with the prohibition and complete destruction of all chemical weapons, and one which will gather universal support.

Over and above its considerable importance for the security of all countries, such an agreement on the elimination of an entire category of weapons of mass destruction should serve as an example for multilateral negotiations on other disarmament issues. It will also provide proof that with political will technical problems, no matter how complicated, may be overcome.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Algeria for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of India, Ambassador Teja.

Mr. TEJA (India): Mr. President, at the outset, I would like to convey to you my delegation's felicitations on your assumption of the presidency for this month of April. I am confident that your experience and wisdom will help in guiding the work of the CD during this crucial month, on the eve of the third special session on disarmament. May I also take this opportunity to express our appreciation to Ambassador von Stülpnagel of the Federal Republic of Germany, who presided over the Conference on Disarmament in an efficient and effective manner during the previous month. I would not like to miss this opportunity to record our thanks to his predecessor, Ambassador Rose of the German Democratic Republic for so ably

(Mr. Teja, India)

presiding over the proceedings in the month preceding that. In my statement today, I would like to focus on the improved and effective functioning of the Conference on Disarmament.

I have the privilege to be a member of the Group of Seven, which also deals with this issue under the able chairmanship of Ambassador Fan of China. Last year, our Group was able to discuss two aspects in detail and submitted its report to the Conference. These two items relate to the establishment of subsidiary bodies and the annual report to the United Nations General Assembly. The results of our Group's deliberations are contained in CD/WP.286, which was also the subject of discussions in informal plenary last year. My statement today reflects my delegation's approach to other aspects of this subject. I might state for the record that the recommendations contained in CD/WP.286 dated 24 July 1987 are acceptable to my delegation.

Let me begin by making a few general comments before taking up specific issues. The unique characteristics of the CD arise out of its role as the single multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament. Our discussions and recommendations, therefore, should be guided by the logic of enhancing the effectiveness of the role of the CD. It cannot be otherwise. This unique quality sets the CD apart from other organizations undertaking multilateral work in the field of disarmament. Suggestions which deflect from this role or dilute it cannot, therefore, serve our common purpose.

We recognize, of course, that procedural deadlocks do not necessarily reflect inefficient rules of procedure but rather underlying political differences. The long debates on the rules of procedure may often convey an impression of complex bureaucratic wranglings to an outsider, but we know that this is not the case. Nevertheless, we do believe that such discussions are exercises that cannot help resolve basic differences on issues. The importance of the requisite political will must not therefore be underestimated. What is needed is the development and gradual enlargement of areas of common understanding. Our discussions on the rules of procedure can only be meaningful and productive if seen in this context.

It is against this backdrop that we must look for ways and means to help reflect new political realities and technological developments, in order to make the CD more responsive to present-day challenges. I would even say that we are fortunate in our existing rules of procedure, which, to a great extent, do provide us with the necessary flexibility.

We must accept the fact that the CD has virtually disappeared from public attention as an important forum for negotiations. Public support is necessary for our work even when negotiations take place away from the glare of publicity. I would therefore suggest that to restore the CD's importance in the public mind, we consider taking steps to enhance the external perception and awareness of the CD and its work, to raise the level of participation, especially in plenary sessions, and to provide for greater interaction with NGOs and the scientific community.

(Mr. Teja, India)

To help improve the quality of results from the CD, we need to focus on the nature of the input. I believe that the CD would benefit from increased inputs at an expert level. We have all appreciated the work done by the Group of Scientific Experts in connection with the monitoring of a nuclear test ban. But now I am thinking of a more intensive interaction. I agree with the suggestions made by Ambassador van Schaik that the expertise of national delegations must be strengthened by including experts in the delegations, and that the CD secretariat should seek the assistance of legal experts in drafting treaty language - a matter especially relevant in our present stage of work in the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. In addition, I believe that the CD could invite eminent scientists, outstanding in their own fields, to talk to us of technical aspects of the issues under consideration. I have no doubt that such discussions, if conducted by internationally renowned scientists whose objectivity is undisputed, would help in clarifying the technical aspects which often slow down the pace of our negotiations on highly complex issues.

I have already reiterated my delegation's agreement with the recommendations contained in WP.286. The general negotiating mandate of the CD is, in my view, more fundamental, and the rules of procedure of the CD, including rule 23, can only be interpreted in this context. At the same time, I believe that some of the procedural aspects can be streamlined by providing for the automatic re-establishment of ad hoc committees every year till their mandate, as derived from the general negotiating mandate of the CD, is fulfilled.

There have been a number of suggestions for intensification of our work. The duration of the sessions of the CD could be increased by at least six weeks without affecting appreciably the existing schedule of services. This could be done by adding a four-week session from mid-November to mid-December, as is now happening for chemical weapons, and starting the spring session in mid-January instead of at the beginning of February. The work of the CD could be intensified if ad hoc committees could meet continuously in a concentrated manner and during specific periods of time. This would also help in ensuring expert participation. A possible programme of work could be:

A two-weeks general debate in the plenary. As far as possible, delegations should be encouraged to participate at the highest level, such as ministers or above;

A three-week session for each ad hoc committee, which would run not in parallel but successively, with short two-or-three-day breaks between each session. At present there are eight substantive agenda items, which would imply the setting up of eight ad hoc committees. During this working period of 24 weeks, there would be one plenary session per week;

At the end of the year, we can visualize a two-week plenary session for adoption of the annual report.

(Mr. Teja, India)

The time spread, including short breaks, would total approximately 33 weeks. Naturally, this would be staggered so as to take into account the UNDC and First Committee meetings.

Intensification of work is useful if it leads to goal-oriented work, but not if it leads to a proliferation of meetings. The programme suggested offers an opportunity for focusing our attention more sharply on our basic goals, keeping in mind the unique characteristics of the CD.

On the rules of consensus, the position of the Group of 21 is already well reflected in CD/330. We believe that decisions should continue to be taken by consensus, but that consensus should not be used to prevent the effective performance of the CD. In other words, consensus should not be allowed to become the power of veto. Rule 23 provides for the establishment of subsidiary bodies as an effective means of carrying out the work of the CD. Yet the consensus rule has often been used to prevent the establishment of subsidiary bodies. This cannot in any way be understood to contribute to the improved and effective functioning of the CD.

Let me say a few words on the question of membership and the participation of non-members in the work of the Conference. The pros and cons of limited membership are evident. The CD, like its predecessor bodies, has been characterized by limited membership. But the present membership of the CD is more suited to present-day needs because it is "globally multilateral"; it includes all five nuclear-weapon States. At a different level, the First Committee in the General Assembly represents a "universal multilateralism". I believe we can examine with an open mind an expansion of the membership of the CD, keeping in mind the characteristic of limited membership, but relating it to "global multilateralism" rather than to the "political balance" of the past decades. It is an issue which needs to be discussed in detail. Partial implementation of decisions taken on the basis of principles which are possibly in the process of revision does not seem to us to be a satisfactory means of resolving this question.

In the same vein, I believe that the concept of "global multilateralism" can be enhanced by providing the requisite opportunity to any country which can contribute to and facilitate the work of the CD. The role of the non-members has to be seen in this context. We are aware of the important contributions to our work made by some of the non-member delegations. Here again, we need to take a hard look at streamlining the procedures and providing a greater automaticity for their participation in both the plenary and the subsidiary bodies.

The complementarity of bilateral and multilateral negotiations is an accepted fact. This idea needs to be translated into a more concrete relationship, which can provide for mutual stimulation and reinforcement.

(Mr. Teja, India)

I have outlined our ideas in some detail because the effectiveness of the CD is an issue of vital concern to all our delegations here. These ideas are guided by a spirit of pragmatism and flexibility. The forthcoming SSOD-III provides us with an opportune moment to take stock of the situation and visualize ways and means which can enable us to perform better and face the challenges of the forthcoming decade.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of India for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of the United Kingdom, Ambassador Solesby.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Mr. President, may I first congratulate you on your accession to the presidency. I much look forward to working under your guidance, and may I thank the previous President, Ambassador von Stülpnagel, for his effective leadership last month. I have already had the opportunity to express my appreciation to Ambassador Rose for his presidency during the first month of our session.

A number of distinguished representatives have offered comments on the subject of the improved and effective functioning of the Conference on Disarmament. I have just listened with interest to the statement made by the Ambassador of India. In addition, the Group of Seven are considering the matter under the chairmanship of Ambassador Fan, and I understand we are likely to have a report from them in the near future. I too would like to offer a few thoughts as a contribution to the debate.

It is clearly right that the Conference should from time to time look critically at its machinery to make sure it is running as efficiently as possible. This is particularly timely when a main item on the agenda of the third special session is addressed to the effectiveness of the United Nations disarmament machinery. As an independent organ, the Conference on Disarmament should make sure its own house is in order.

I see no reason to believe that any radical overhaul is required. Tinkering with machinery for the sake of tinkering can often leave things worse rather than better. But a check-up is sensible from time to time.

First our agenda. The agenda of the Conference was drawn up almost a decade ago, and much has changed since then. It would seem right for the Conference, perhaps in the summer session, to see whether the agenda fully covers developments in recent years in approaches to disarmament. We may then find that certain subjects can be rested for a year or two, or combined with other subjects, or even dropped. Conversely, we may wish to insert new subjects which have attracted increasing interest and support in past years, and which could benefit from the sort of in-depth treatment the Conference is well suited to apply.

Secondly, membership and participation. Some countries have proposed a step-by-step move by the Conference towards universal membership. Such a course would leave the Conference a very different animal, closer to the First Committee of the General Assembly than the Conference we know today. In my

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

view, this would be a considerable loss. Indeed, I would venture to prophesy that before long our successors would find it necessary to create another restricted negotiating forum with the same advantages of intimacy and continuity which are now the hallmarks of this body. Like the Ambassador of Canada and others, I too would hope we could find a way out of the impasse which has prevented the long-agreed adjustment to the size of our membership, for which Norway is the Western candidate. However, I very much doubt whether still further expansion is the right path to follow.

I do favour examining systematically the present arrangements for participation by non-members. Perhaps we shall find that there is no need for any improvement, but at least we should make sure that we are not putting unnecessary obstacles in the way of participation. We are after all a negotiating organ, not an exclusive club.

We might also ask ourselves whether more needs to be done to bridge any communication gap between Conference members and non-member Governments. I have in mind in particular our negotiations for a ban on chemical weapons. It seems to me important that, as we work our way towards a convention, we should do what we can to make sure outsiders know what we are about. I do not have anything elaborate to suggest. At this stage it would seem sufficient for each delegation to do what they can to spread the word, on an informal and individual basis, to non-member delegations both here in Geneva and perhaps still more during our forthcoming visits to New York.

Thirdly, the periodicity of meetings. We favour a tight programme of meetings for the Conference, especially for the negotiations on chemical weapons. However, we share the view of those who have emphasized the need to balance alternate periods of negotiation and recess. It is essential that time be allowed for review and innovative thinking. There is a point beyond which it can become a hindrance to progress rather than a help to add meeting on top of meeting.

Fourthly, I should like to mention a few small but useful steps we might take to improve our organization. Greater concentration of plenary debate has been mentioned, by the Ambassador of Hungary for example. So has a more compact form of annual report to the General Assembly. Stricter insistence on starting meetings at the scheduled time - not only in plenary but in ad hoc committees and working groups too - is another desirable reform, obvious but elusive. Could we in our summer session agree that all meetings should begin within 10 minutes of the announced time? If there were a good reason for an immediate suspension of the meeting, then it should be explained.

Lastly, a comment or two on the report submitted by the Group of Seven last July (CD/WP.286). I understand that there was insufficient time then for the report to be properly considered by the Conference, and I hope there will be an opportunity for a fuller discussion of whatever revised report the Group of Seven submits during the present session. I have already voiced support for the idea of simplifying the preparation of our annual report to the General Assembly, which was usefully elaborated by the Group of Seven. We also think the Group of Seven's proposal for automatic continuation of the

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

work of subsidiary bodies from year to year deserves further study. On the other hand, my delegation is not yet convinced of the desirability of establishing ad hoc committees for each agenda item without individual mandates. Our items are at different stages of development, and it seems to me we need different mandates to reflect this. I found the comments of the Ambassador of the Netherlands particularly persuasive in this respect.

These are some contributions to the review of the functioning of the Conference which I hope will be carried further during what remains of our spring session and resumed in our summer session. It would be a mistake to expect too much to emerge from the exercise. But my delegation is ready to examine carefully any proposal which might serve to improve the functioning of the Conference.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for her statement and for the kind words she addressed to the Chair.

I have no other speakers inscribed on my list for today. Does any other member wish to take the floor at this moment? I recognize the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Mr. LUDEKING (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. President, I should first of all like to congratulate you on behalf of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency for the month of April. I would like to reiterate that in the discharge of your important functions you can rely on the full support of my delegation. We are confident that under your able guidance, the spring part of this year's session will be drawn to a successful conclusion.

Today I would like to draw attention to a note from the Federal Republic of Germany addressed to all States participating in the Conference on Disarmament. This note, which has just been distributed, was prompted by recent reports about the use of chemical weapons in the war between Iraq and Iran. In view of this, my Government appeals to all States participating in the Conference to give the highest priority to a global ban on chemical weapons, and calls for intensification of the efforts of the Conference aimed at the conclusion of a global convention on chemical weapons.

We have asked for this note to be circulated as an official document of the Conference on Disarmament.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany for his statement and for his kind words addressed to the Chair. Your request will be taken care of by the secretariat. Is there any other delegation that wishes to take the floor at this moment? I see none.

May I now turn to another subject? The secretariat has circulated today a timetable of meetings to be held by the Conference during the coming week. As agreed in the programme of work for the first part of the annual session, we are due to start next week our consideration of the reports of the ad hoc subsidiary bodies, as well as the consideration of the special report to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

(The President)

You will notice that the timetable follows the practice of previous sessions in the preparation of annual reports. I propose that we hold an informal meeting on Tuesday, 12 April, immediately after the plenary meeting, to proceed to the first reading of the technical parts of the special report. Those parts are contained in working paper CD/WP.336, which is being circulated in all languages in delegations' boxes today. The original English was already available yesterday. The draft substantive paragraphs under specific agenda items will be discussed first, in accordance with our practice, at informal open-ended consultations, and later at an informal meeting of the Conference. We shall start on Monday morning with working paper CD/WP.337, relating to agenda item 1, "Nuclear test ban", which was circulated in delegations' boxes yesterday. Consideration of the draft substantive paragraphs on agenda item 3, entitled "Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters", will start on Tuesday afternoon. The relevant draft is contained in working paper CD/WP.338, which was also circulated yesterday and today in all languages. Additional substantive paragraphs on agenda item 2, "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament", will be circulated in all languages today and tomorrow, as working paper CD/WP.339, together with working paper CD/WP.340 on "New weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons". I suggest that consideration of those working papers should also begin on Tuesday, 12 April, immediately after the informal consultations on agenda item 3.

I am indicating for the time being only the opening meetings for the consideration of the draft substantive paragraphs, since it will be up to the participants in the consultations to arrange for further meetings as necessary. For example, if we finish the discussion on the technical parts at our informal meeting on Tuesday, the time allocated for a second informal meeting on the technical parts on Thursday might be used for the informal consultations. However, I should like to impress on you that it is necessary for us to proceed as quickly as possible if we wish to maintain the date of 28 April as the closing date for the first part of the annual session.

I should also like to note that the Group of Seven is proceeding with the preparation of its report on the improved and effective functioning of the Conference. Draft substantive paragraphs on this question may need to wait a few days more to enable the secretariat to prepare the first draft.

On this understanding, I suggest that we adopt the informal paper containing the timetable of meetings for the coming week. If there is no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I have no more business for today, and now intend to adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Tuesday, 12 April at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 11 a.m.