
Conference on Disarmament

17 March 2011
English

Final record of the one thousand two hundred and sixteenth plenary meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Thursday, 17 March 2011, at 10.20 a.m.

President: Mr. Pedro Oyarce(Chile)

* Reissued for technical reasons on 22 May 2012.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I declare open the 1216th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

Before beginning this session's work, we would like to convey, through Ambassador Suda, our compassion to the Government and people of Japan in these times of grief. To the families of victims we send our regrets and to the injured the moral fortitude to recover from this tragedy that has moved all of humanity. I invite you to observe a minute of silence in memory of those who have left us in these terrible circumstances.

Many thanks and may God bless Japan. I give the floor to Ambassador Suda, Permanent Representative of Japan.

Mr. Suda (Japan): Thank you, Mr. President, and all colleagues. Thank you for your very kind words and condolences to Japan and the time of silence.

As a result of the unprecedented 9.0 magnitude earthquake that struck the north-east coast of Japan last Friday, hundreds of thousands of evacuated people in Japan are now experiencing immense suffering and hardship.

Yet, despite this catastrophe, Japan does not feel alone. On behalf of the Government and the people of Japan, I would like to express our highest appreciation for the many warm words and sincere offers of help extended to us. The Government of Japan has already received assistance from many countries, international organizations and friends.

In spite of the enormous losses and continuing difficulties, the Government of Japan is working to the utmost extent to protect the public and to keep damage to the minimum possible. We are also taking every possible measure for ensuring the safety of and providing support to the diplomatic corps and foreign people in Japan, including temporary visitors from overseas.

I would like here to briefly touch upon the situation concerning the Fukushima nuclear power plant, which should be of great concern to many delegations.

When the earthquake occurred last Friday, operations in all three reactors were automatically shut down. However, due to the destruction of the cooling systems, mainly caused by an extremely high tsunami, the temperature inside the reactors started to rise and remained at a relatively high level. In addition, other problems have occurred related to the heating up of the spent fuel pools in some of the reactor buildings. Our experts and workers started to use seawater and are continuing to work on cooling of the residual heat of the reactors by pouring seawater into them. This operation is ongoing and, with regard to the problem of the spent fuel, our self-defence forces are now trying to pour water from the ground and from the air.

Inevitably, there have been some leaks of radiation. On 12 March, the Government directed the people living within a 20-km radius of the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power plant to evacuate. Further, on 15 March, the Government directed the people living in the 20-to-30-km radius from the Fukushima Dai-ichi plant to stay indoors. These are the measures to ensure the safety of the local citizens just in case the situation worsens.

Despite the continuing conditions of some of the reactors and spent fuel, the authorities are making every possible effort to cool down the reactors and the spent fuel pools in order to prevent further deterioration. The Government of Japan considers that it is essential to provide timely and accurate information not only to the people of Japan, but also to the international community. In this respect, we are providing updated information as much as possible to the international community through announcements to the media and via diplomatic channels.

On Sunday, Prime Minister Kan said this earthquake, tsunami and nuclear incident have been the biggest crisis in the 65 years since the end of the Second World War to Japan. But I hope that through the efforts of our people and the strong assistance of the international community, Japan will overcome this crisis.

Again, I thank all of you for your sincere support extended to the people of Japan.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Many thanks, Ambassador. Do any of the delegations wish to take the floor at this time? If not, I shall move on and give the floor to the delegations of Algeria, Indonesia (on behalf of the countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)), Norway, Colombia, Sri Lanka, China and the Russian Federation.

This first part will be for general statements. Then we will examine items 5, 6 and 7, with the delegations of the United States and Belarus listed to speak, following which I will make some concluding remarks. A few delegations have requested the opportunity to make comments following these remarks, namely the delegations of China, Malaysia, Colombia, Ecuador, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and Finland. This is the programme of work for today. I now give the floor to the alternate Representative of Algeria, Mr. Hamza Khelif.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in Arabic*): Ambassador Jazaïry of Algeria would have liked to take the floor today to extend his thanks and appreciation to you, Ambassador Oyarce, for the considerable efforts that you have made as President of the Conference to advance our work. However, it is difficult for him to attend as he is in New York as part of his responsibilities to the Human Rights Council. Therefore, he has assigned me to read the following statement on his behalf.

At the outset, I would like to extend my most sincere condolences and profound sympathy to the people and the Government of Japan following the natural disaster that befell that country. I would also like to express the support of my country, Algeria, to our fellow State, Japan, in overcoming this harsh ordeal. We ask the Ambassador of Japan kindly to convey this message to his Government.

According to some reports, this catastrophe has caused radioactive leaks that constitute a public health hazard. If this is the result of an accident involving a programme for the peaceful use of nuclear energy, how would it be if it were the result of the accidental or deliberate use of nuclear weapons? Can you imagine the scale of the catastrophe that would result should a conflict break out in which these weapons of destruction were used? I regret to say that we only realize the scale of the threats that we face once they have materialized, and we forget or ignore the need to take preventive action. This alerts us to the fact that the principal and most serious threat that we must confront collectively in the framework of the Conference on Disarmament is the existence of immense arsenals of nuclear weapons that serve dangerous nuclear doctrines inherited from the cold war era, not to mention the enormous quantities of fissile material used in the production of lethal weapons that are dispersed here and there.

At the start of the session, the Conference heard the Secretary-General of the United Nations and then, under your presidency, a number of eminent figures – including, for the first time, the President of the United Nations General Assembly. If this is indicative of anything, it is of the great interest accorded to the Conference and the hopes pinned on it by the international community.

Algeria still believes that document CD/1864 is an excellent basis on which to start the substantive work of the Conference. However, Algeria will certainly not obstruct any initiative that is agreed by consensus. In this context, I would like to

extend my profound gratitude to you for your persistent work, which shows your determination and will to move ahead, despite the difficulties — known to all — involved in reaching a shared view of a programme of work. We hope that the programme will take into account the concerns of member States and so make it possible to establish a world that enjoys stability.

In this regard, we commend the methodology that you adopted during your presidency and consultations, which were conducted in a clear and transparent manner. We also thank you for the ideas that you put forward concerning the programme of work. We have sensed from the discussions that a majority of delegations supports a programme of work based on CD/1864. Some delegations believe that we need to revise and develop this document in line with subsequent developments, while some others are not against adopting a simplified programme of work, if objections to document CD/1864 remain.

We appreciate all efforts and positions and believe that any initiative, if it is to be successful, should take into account the following points: first, it should take into account the priorities of all States and groups of member States; second, it should respect the rules of procedure of the Conference and should take the final document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament of 1978 as a baseline; and third, such an initiative should be a step that would contribute to making progress towards starting negotiations and substantive work based on the hard-won gains achieved and balances struck heretofore.

Discussions in previous years have shown clearly that it is futile to seek the reasons why the Conference's mechanisms, procedures and methodology of work have been disrupted. The situation of the Conference reflects the balances and policies adopted outside it; in short, the basic factor is the political will that must be always there for the Conference. Unfortunately, it is very clear that the time is not yet ripe to yield the necessary conditions in which negotiations could begin. Moreover, resorting to alternative negotiating frameworks would not be an appropriate solution as that would not resolve the main obstacle before the Conference, namely, that all member States must have political will.

In conclusion, I call on you, Mr. President and future presidents, to continue with your efforts and consultations in order to move forward and so enable the Conference to start substantive work so that it really deserves to be called the single multilateral negotiating body on matters relating to disarmament. We bear a heavy but noble responsibility to conclude multilateral international instruments that serve as building blocks with which to attain the hopes and aspirations of the international community for a world in which peace and stability prevail. Should the situation remain blocked, it might be helpful to call a fourth special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament in order for us to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of all multilateral disarmament-related matters and mechanisms and reorder the priorities that must be addressed, in accordance with an agreed concept of collective security.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much. I give the floor to Ambassador Djani, Permanent Representative of Indonesia who, as I understand, will give a statement on behalf of ASEAN.

Mr. Djani (Indonesia): I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the ASEAN member States in the Conference, namely Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar and Viet Nam, and the ASEAN observer States in the Conference, namely the Philippines and Thailand, also associate themselves with this statement.

Before going to the substance, permit me to express our sincere appreciation to Ambassador Suda of Japan for enlightening us on the situation on the ground in the aftermath of the tsunami and earthquake in Japan of last week. ASEAN express our deepest sympathy and condolences to the people and Government of Japan in the wake of this earthquake and tsunami. Having experienced such a catastrophe with similar magnitude, we share the pain and suffering it causes. Our prayers and thoughts are with those who lost their lives in this devastating calamity, and please kindly, Mr. Ambassador Suda, convey our condolences to the bereaved families back home.

We reiterate our deep concern at the threat posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons, their possible use or threat of use, and the risk of their proliferation.

Nuclear disarmament has always been our utmost priority, and we have always been committed to efforts towards the attainment of a world free of nuclear weapons. ASEAN is committed to implement the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Zone or SEANWFZ Treaty and its Plan of Action, and urge nuclear-weapon States to consider their early signing of the SEANWFZ Protocol to further promote South-East Asia as a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

We would also like to recall the first resolution of the United Nations General Assembly of 1946, which, among others, called for the elimination of nuclear weapons from national arsenals, and the Final Document of the United Nations General Assembly special session on disarmament of 1978, which placed the greatest importance on nuclear disarmament.

We believe that pursuing nuclear disarmament is the rationale of the establishment of the Conference, and we would certainly like to remind Conference member States of this ground. It is regrettable that the current stalemate has prevented this body from commencing any negotiation on substantive issues in its agenda for over a decade.

In this regard, we recall the adoption of United Nations General Assembly resolution 65/56 on nuclear disarmament, which called upon the Conference on Disarmament to establish, as soon as possible and as the highest priority, an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament early in 2011 and to commence negotiations on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified framework of time, including a nuclear weapons convention.

We also recall the adoption of the follow-on actions of the 2010 NPT Review Conference, particularly recommendations on nuclear disarmament, and encourage member States of the Conference parties to the NPT to make efforts to implement these actions.

We have always been supportive of the work of the Conference. In this regard, we would like to reiterate our full support to the past and present P-6 of the Conference, including yourself, Mr. President, and express our readiness to continue consultations on any proposal aimed at fostering consensus on the programme of work.

In order to help advance the work of the Conference, we believe that the proposal for an appointment of special coordinator for the expansion of the membership of the Conference is a major step towards achieving this goal, and therefore receives our full support.

We also value and welcome the contributions made by civil society to the work of the Conference. Their efforts are important for generating support for nuclear disarmament at the grass-roots level, and their wealth of knowledge, experience and expertise enrich the work of the Conference and help to stimulate substantive discussions.

It is our belief that such expansion of the membership and engagement with civil society will create the much-needed political impetus which will contribute to the progress of the Conference's work.

To conclude, we encourage member States of the Conference to demonstrate the political will for the Conference to resume its function as the single multilateral disarmament negotiation forum.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you, Ambassador. It is my pleasure to give the floor to Ambassador Angell-Hansen, Permanent Representative of Norway.

Ms. Angell-Hansen (Norway): At the outset, let me express our heartfelt condolences to the Government and people of Japan for the loss of lives, the enormous material damage and the suffering they are going through. We admire the immense efforts made to alleviate the impact of the disasters and the bravery and dignity shown by the Japanese people in the face of this triple disaster.

The horrors of the risks of further radioactive leakages put the stalemate of this Conference into perspective. How can we prove to the peoples all over the world that we are serious about dealing with the pressing issues pertaining to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation?

Mr. President, I commend you for the excellent way you have conducted the Chilean presidency, reflecting the strong commitment by your country to the disarmament agenda, a commitment very much shared by my country. I thank you for the instrumental role you played in giving civil society, represented by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the opportunity again this year to interact with the Conference on 8 March. I pay tribute to the League for their strong and consistent contribution to promoting disarmament. It is obvious that we need strong voices from civil society also on disarmament, and I encourage all forthcoming Conference presidencies to enhance our interaction with civil society. Such engagement can take place either in informal or formal settings. We need an inspired and fresh look at the Conference. Ideas and proposals from civil society can help provide just that. We have been encouraged by recent statements from members to this effect.

Mr. President, both your presidency and the Canadian one have introduced substantial discussions to the Conference. We welcome this, while at the same time we need to remind ourselves that the Conference's mandate is to negotiate. We would be careful not to duplicate the United Nations First Committee. Hence, we would question whether this year's session could be perceived as acceptable progress unless it is manifested with a programme of work clearly addressing our mandate.

Independent of the quantity and quality of the statements we have heard so far this session, we still feel deep frustration over the more than decade-long stalemate in the Conference. Basically, the tradition of using consensus on procedural issues in this body continues to be a major problem, and one reason why we should consider alternative strategies towards disarmament.

However, let it be clear. The Conference has its important mandate, and we are aware of your determined attempts to identify elements that may lead towards consensus on a programme of work, and to identify agenda items that may pave the way for substantive negotiations in the near future. Norway's position is that top priority should be given to nuclear disarmament, with the objective of a total elimination of such weapons.

We would also emphasize that "Prevention of an arms race in outer space" is an urgent issue. There is a window of opportunity for the Conference to deal with this agenda item in a preventive manner. Unless not dealt with soon, we will gradually be confronted by an increasing number of countries claiming national security interest as an excuse for

inaction. We must avoid this becoming a reality, making PAROS even less ripe for negotiations in the future than in the current setting. It is our joint responsibility today to do all we can to avoid escalating complications for the future.

We are not hiding the fact that we are sceptical as to the Conference's ability as an institution to deal with disarmament, reflecting the long-standing stalemate of this body. We would even outright claim that the Conference at present is dysfunctional when it comes to delivering on its mandate. The Conference needs to reform itself. The consensus rule should not be applied to procedural issues, membership should be universal, civil society should play an active role and we should find new ways to foster cross-regional cooperation.

Yet we fully recognize that the Conference does not operate in a vacuum. It is obvious that there are countries with legitimate and serious security interests and concerns directly linked to our agenda items. Indeed, we would even go further – we recognize that there are countries outside of the Conference with legitimate security interests directly linked to our agenda items. At present, these countries still have to trust the countries inside this body to deal with their security interests. That is not fair.

Nuclear disarmament should be a pressing issue for all States. It should also be a pressing humanitarian issue reflecting the devastating effects on populations, as well as on the environment, from the use of weapons of mass destruction. Nuclear weapons are the most inhumane, indiscriminate and disproportionate weapons invented. Their use would be illegal under international humanitarian law. We need to place the humanitarian imperative at the centre of our efforts. In this respect, we have much to learn from other, more recent disarmament processes with successful outcomes.

We are aware that most countries maintain that consensus is vital when it comes to nuclear disarmament. Norway is not fully convinced. We believe it could be possible to develop norms against the use of nuclear weapons, and even to outlaw them, without a consensus decision, and that such norms eventually will be applied globally.

We cannot leave it to the nuclear States alone to decide when and how to do away with these weapons. We need to address this urgently. If the Conference proves unable to deliver on these expectations, we must explore other options to pursue a world free of nuclear weapons.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much, Ambassador. I give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Colombia, Ambassador Arango Olmos.

Ms. Arango Olmos (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): Before I begin my presentation, please allow me to express my country and delegation's sincerest condolences to the Ambassador of Japan, Mr. Akio Suda, and to the people of Japan for the tragedy that has befallen them since last Friday's earthquake and tsunami. I wish to convey to you Colombia's compassion and eagerness to cooperate in these difficult times.

I do not wish to let the opportunity of this meeting marking the end of the presidency of Chile, which has guided us with great wisdom and skill, pass us by without a few thoughts on the issues that, in my delegation's opinion, need to be considered in our future work.

First, we believe that the participation of civil society and the launching of parallel events, regardless of any criticism or reservations, have been very useful as an intellectual exercise. They have given us the opportunity to renew ideas, expand concepts and learn about other positions and viewpoints. We agree that these activities should not replace the work of the Conference on Disarmament, but they have value as positive experiences which we should continue to explore.

Second, the flexible methodology based on the tentative timetable put forward by Canada and taken up by Chile has allowed us to move forward in our work and avoid endless procedural questions.

Therefore we believe that a simplified programme of work would be an efficient way of making substantive progress in 2011. In other words, a programme of work as intended in our rules of procedure — to which we must adhere — that would provide a comprehensive and balanced timetable of activities taking into consideration all agenda items and including a debate on the mandates we wish to assign ourselves in each of these areas.

Some think that setting ourselves such a programme of work would be a step backward. But the real step backward was in 2009 when we were unable to implement decision CD/1864, or last year when we failed to reach consensus. The outlook for the 2011 period is different from previous years and we must adapt our tools, including the programme of work, to current dynamics if we wish to truly move forward.

The responsibility for this is not only incumbent on the rotating presidency. The success of this forum will depend on the efforts of each and every one of us and, above all, on our political will, understood as an exercise in flexibility and creativity.

It is exactly that, creativity, which the Chilean presidency's non-paper displays. We agree that this constructive ambiguity, as Ambassador Oyarce has called it, is flexible enough for the Conference on Disarmament to launch into substantive work, should we insist on a programme of work that links a timetable of activities with the mandates.

My delegation is flexible with regard to any approximation of a work programme we may achieve. As we have mentioned, what drives us is the need for negotiation which, I believe, all the delegations share.

The safety of all the earth's inhabitants, our very survival, is at stake. No country, however powerful or rich, can escape the nuclear threat, regardless of its powers of dissuasion. The lack of substantive progress makes the Conference on Disarmament seem unaware of this danger.

Regrettably, despite the initial enthusiasm of the 2011 sessions, the Conference appears to be falling back into the status quo. This is of grave concern to my delegation.

As the officials who addressed the Conference during the high-level meeting on 8 and 9 March mentioned, the mandate of the Conference on Disarmament is to negotiate. In light of the progress made in disarmament, to which we have all referred, and an environment conducive to further improvements, it is inconceivable that this forum should remain stalled. It is a situation the international community, civil society and States cannot understand, let alone tolerate, as ministers and vice-ministers of foreign affairs have expressed in this very room.

The operation of the disarmament apparatus, its very legitimacy, is at stake, and the Conference on Disarmament is one of its cornerstones. But as with any machine, if one of its parts is dysfunctional, it must be fixed or replaced. The future of this forum is in your hands.

For this reason, I invite you to listen to one another, to move from dispassionate commentary to a more vibrant dialogue, driven by the spirit of transparency and the appetite for negotiation. This is a call for flexibility and openness to the various options and not being wedded to preset opinions. But above all, we ask that you demonstrate the political will to advance the Conference on Disarmament and our agenda items. Thank you very much.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you, Ambassador, for the cooperative spirit shown by the delegation of Colombia.

I will now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka, Ms. Kshenuka Senewiratne.

Ms. Senewiratne (Sri Lanka): At the outset, through Ambassador Suda, I wish to offer the condolences of the Government and people of Sri Lanka to the Government and people of Japan on the devastating earthquake and tsunami. The world has witnessed before the patience and the resilience of the Japanese people, and we are confident that this would enable Japan to reconstruct rapidly and move forward. We thank Ambassador Suda for his succinct briefing on the status of the Fukushima nuclear power plant having become victim to this recent natural disaster. As assured by the Japanese Government, there is no cause for panic, which should caution us in the global arena not to overreact on the peaceful use of nuclear material, but ensure that the necessary safeguards are in place at all times.

Ambassador Oyarce, my delegation applauds your erudite stewardship of the Conference on Disarmament. Over the past weeks, you have tirelessly steered this body in a transparent and inclusive manner. We appreciate the manner in which you have discharged your mandate and ensured constructive dialogue on the core issues, culminating from your balanced and comprehensive approach to our work. This augurs well in pushing the Conference towards establishing a substantive programme of work based on these tenets.

As we have consistently observed, consensus is irrevocable in the attainment of international security and its sustenance. It is also manifest in our rules of procedure. To reach our common objective of witnessing a safer world, free of nuclear weapons, it is imperative to engage all States concerned in an equitable manner.

Therefore, we need to recognize the urgency with which to commence negotiations on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specific time frame, including a nuclear weapons convention. We need to continue in earnest our efforts towards achieving this goal.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much, Ambassador. I give the floor to the Permanent Representative of China, Ambassador Wang Qun.

Mr. Wang Qun (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like first of all to convey its sympathy and condolences to the people of Japan, who have suffered losses following the massive earthquake and tsunami in their country, and express its deep sorrow for the victims. It hopes that the Japanese people will be able to overcome this hardship and rebuild their homeland as soon as possible.

The Conference has now come to a critical juncture, where opportunities and challenges cross paths. On the one hand, the field of international arms control and disarmament has clearly had renewed momentum in recent years. The international community broadly hopes that renewed multilateral disarmament and especially the work of this Conference will achieve security for all through mutually beneficial and cooperative dialogue. To this end, each party has unstintingly increased its political support for the Conference. The Chinese President, Mr. Hu Jintao, and the President of the United States, Mr. Obama, have on numerous occasions expressed their support for the Conference's work. The Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Yang Jiechi, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Mr. Lavrov, the United States Secretary of State, Ms. Clinton, as well as the Australian, Canadian and very many other foreign ministers have come one after another to address the Conference. The United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Ban Ki-moon, has on three occasions visited the Conference and called on it to break out of the impasse as quickly as possible.

On the other hand, we are confronted with the very real problem of how to address the different concerns of all the parties, move the Conference out of the rut, and resume its substantive work as quickly as possible. A number of our colleagues have felt despair at how long it is taking the Conference to break this deadlock. Is the Conference not after all a worthy mechanism? How can we view the issue of the Conference's work objectively? In the end, what is the state of the Conference today? Will it be able to break out of the fog and see some daylight, or even once again find the splendour of the sun's rays?

I should like now to discuss the views of China on these questions.

First, why is the Conference a good mechanism for multilateral disarmament negotiations? I believe that this is the case not only because of its rich history, during which it achieved the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and a good many other crucial arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties, thus contributing to international peace and security. More importantly, although the Conference's treaties have not been flawless, they are in the present circumstances the instruments that are most universal. The Conference differs from exclusive disarmament and non-proliferation mechanisms. Its membership is broadly representative, and has expanded from 40 member States at its inception to 65 now, including developed and developing countries, with members of importance from the different regions and groups, in particular the five nuclear powers, all the States possessing nuclear weapons and those States with established nuclear capability. The disarmament treaties achieved by the Conference reflect the shared interests of the international community and help maintain that community's common security. The Conference also exemplifies a spirit of democracy and the rule of law, with a favourable international legal basis and system of safeguards. It was established by the first Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, following broad consultations among all United Nations Member States, which authorized it as the sole multilateral forum for disarmament. The Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament also explicitly established that the Conference should conduct its work by consensus and adopt its own rules of procedure. The fact that consensus is a core principle in the rules of procedure is a hallmark of the Conference, fundamentally setting it apart from the General Assembly and other multilateral disarmament forums. The Conference has thus always been recognized as the sole multilateral disarmament mechanism. Some, because they do not support the principle of consensus, find fault with the Conference and would even prefer to start over from scratch. But interestingly, the vast majority favours the Conference mechanism precisely because of the principle of consensus. That principle both guarantees that any treaty concluded (by such consensus) reflects the common will of the international community as represented by the entire membership of the Conference, and also ensures that, once concluded, such treaties can be effectively implemented. It would certainly not be difficult to start over from scratch. The hard part would be finding out whether a new or different mechanism would actually be as useful or effective as the Conference. This is a question requiring serious thought.

Secondly, how can we objectively deal with the problems facing the Conference? If we are to break the deadlock in the Conference, we must first focus on the crux of the matter, and that is that the deadlock is, I believe, attributable to political factors. The Conference's work is a barometer of the international security situation. Multilateral arms control treaty negotiations are intimately linked with the international security situation; and with the interests of all States. At various stages of history and in various international political and security situations, the agendas and policies of each State in the field of disarmament and security cannot be entirely the same. This inevitably leads to different views of the focus of the Conference and its priorities, or even to discord. Since its inception the Conference has had its ups and downs. It has certainly not always been

smooth sailing, and at times it has seemed like a roller coaster. Some have seen “breakthroughs” or “paralyses” for the Conference in 1998, 2004 and 2009, and I think that reflects this phenomenon. The deadlocks in the Conference are also the result of ways of thinking as well as ways of working. One example is the point of view that deadlocks are caused by the Conference mechanism itself, and specifically by the consensus principle in its rules of procedure. But we then need to think about why, with the same mechanism and rules of procedure, the Conference was able to successfully negotiate the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty? A second example is the idea that open, transparent and equitable intergovernmental negotiations held with the participation of all parties concerned are excessively time-consuming, and that it would be sufficient for only some States to take part in the negotiations, or to pursue negotiations through a non-intergovernmental process. But would such a method be conducive to ensuring universal participation? Can a treaty concluded without the participation of major players be as effective as it ought to be? And further, while the impatience to conclude a treaty is certainly understandable, haste for its own sake is counterproductive. Objectively, does frequently resorting to pressure help resolve conflict, or exacerbate differences? The antagonism we saw last September in New York has already provided us with an answer to that question that is worth thinking about.

Thirdly, how should we consider the Conference’s current situation? Some of our colleagues believe that the Conference has made no progress in recent years and that it has already entered into a state of paralysis. Indeed, the Conference has not concluded an arms control treaty since 1998. However, its achievements and setbacks are not limited to particular times or cases. The Conference’s work is cumulative, moving from quantitative to qualitative change. Preparing, communicating, consulting and discussing are quantitative, while achieving a breakthrough, forming a consensus and concluding treaties are quantum leaps. A cumulative process such as this cannot take place overnight. It requires an accumulation both of political will and of technical efforts. It took 15 years from 1978, when the Chemical Weapons Convention was put on the Conference’s agenda, until an agreement was negotiated, and it took 16 years from 1980, when the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty was placed on the Conference’s agenda, until it was finally concluded. If you count the time from the 1950s, when the Indian Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, first proposed a test ban, then it took even longer. Evaluating the Conference’s current work, we must not become lost in the details; we must see the big picture. We must not look only at the Conference’s shortcomings and ignore its merits. In recent years the Conference’s member States have in various ways pushed for it to break the deadlock and resume substantive work. This kind of tireless effort is indeed the Conference’s most precious asset. It shows that we have not lost confidence, and not lost hope, and above all have not abandoned the noble responsibility for international peace and security that has been placed on our shoulders. The adoption in May 2009 of document CD/1864 provides a fine example, and this year we have had a good start. Under the rotating presidencies of the distinguished Canadian and Chilean ambassadors the Conference has held substantive discussions on each agenda item. Even if we cannot expect the Conference to achieve results every year, time is going by. As Chairman Mao once said, we must “seize the day, seize the hour”.

Fourthly, how do we break the deadlock? The Conference is not operating in a vacuum. Its work is directly influenced by developments in the international and regional security situations. It is by paying attention to the serious security concerns and positions of the various countries and treating them equally, striving to create a win-win situation, that the Conference can quickly move ahead. At the same time, we must tackle the problems of the Conference. International dialogue on this topic is crucial; but to break the current deadlock in the Conference, we believe that an appropriate conceptual approach and an

effective method of work are needed as well. First, we must identify the crux of the problem and take appropriate action to treat it. Secondly, we must find common ground while respecting our differences; especially when working on minute points, we must seek out and identify any budding indications of consensus, without exacerbating contradictions or differences of opinion. Thirdly, we must jointly push the Conference's work forward through an open and transparent intergovernmental process. Fourthly, a step, no matter how small, is worth taking if it is a step in the right direction; it is only by making progress bit by bit that we can turn small victories into great ones. The Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Yang Jiechi, once said in the Conference that "the longest journey begins with a single step, and that rivers and oceans all begin with the smallest of streams". That is my point exactly. Fifthly, we must focus on actual effects, and on our objectives. The current deadlock in the Conference has been caused by political factors. We must rely on political will and political wisdom to break this logjam. The programme of work of the Conference is not a work on semantics; the aim is to break the political deadlock and to begin substantive work, so we must therefore not become bogged down in discussions of specific wording. The Conference now has momentum that was not easy to gain, and it must be cherished and carefully maintained. We must continue to build mutual trust among the members and resolutely seek out and focus on consensus through open and transparent intergovernmental negotiations. A little while ago, the Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Kevin Rudd, in addressing the Conference, quoted the famous words of the late United States President Kennedy: "...we shall never negotiate out of fear, and we shall never fear to negotiate". I believe that the Conference is just such a negotiating forum, for in this august assembly, we too must not fear to negotiate. I believe that if we have a spirit of common cause and shared destiny, if we build confidence and dispel doubts, we in the conference will be able to find a plan acceptable to all. Through our common efforts, let us resume substantive work as soon as possible, so as to further the cause of international arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much, Ambassador. I give the floor to Ambassador Loshchinin of the Russian Federation.

Mr. Loshchinin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): At the outset I would like to offer our heartfelt condolences to the representative of Japan at the Conference on Disarmament, Ambassador Suda, in the wake of the devastating natural disaster that has struck Japan. We are shocked and deeply saddened by the loss of so many lives and the damage caused by the insurgent elements. As Russian President Medvedev remarked in his letter to the Prime Minister of Japan, the Russian people were overcome with sorrow at the tragic news. The Russian Federation, Japan's closest neighbour, is now providing assistance to deal with the aftermath. More than 100 Russian rescue workers are now working in the affected areas, making up the largest foreign presence. The situation at the nuclear power plant affected by the natural disaster has raised particular concern on the part of the international community. We hope that the measures taken by the Government of Japan and specialists will prevent further negative developments and bring the situation under control. The determination, tenacity, dignity, discipline and orderliness shown by the Japanese people in the face of this terrible misfortune deserve nothing but admiration.

We greatly appreciate the efforts that you have made, Mr. President, in coordinating the efforts of the six presidents at the session to arrive at a consensus on the programme of work. That was precisely what the suggestions on the issue that you put forward were aimed at achieving. We trust that the efforts to reach a consensus will be continued by the next presidents. We have previously expressed our views about the situation at the Conference. We largely agree with the assessments made today by our colleagues, in particular by the delegation of China. We do not consider the situation to be critical or hopeless. We must simply continue our work, bearing in mind that there is no alternative to the Conference on Disarmament.

The main priority now is to hold thematic discussions at the Conference. Meetings “on the sidelines” cannot and should not replace the work of the Conference. We believe that the Conference could enhance its credibility by gradually expanding the forum’s membership and taking account of civil society in its work. It would be useful to explore the possibility of holding a future plenary meeting of the Conference to consider the issue of membership of the Conference and the possible forms of NGO participation in its work.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much, Ambassador. I give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh, Ambassador Hannan.

Mr. Hannan (Bangladesh): We join other delegations and colleagues in extending our heartfelt condolences to the friendly Government and the people of Japan at this time of unprecedented natural disasters and the ensuing difficult circumstances. As other delegations have mentioned, the radiation threat emanating from the affected nuclear power plant in Japan reinforces the urgency and abiding relevance of the work of this Conference.

I would like to take this opportunity to convey my sincere appreciation to you, Mr. President, for your very able and effective stewardship of the Conference. You have conducted the business of the Conference in an exemplary manner. We have immensely benefited from your regular and transparent consultations with members in both formal and informal settings. Our honourable Foreign Minister addressed the Conference during your presidency on 1 March 2011 and outlined the priorities for our Government concerning the work of this august body. We have taken note with interest of your helpful proposal for a programme of work that you have shared with us. We do see evident merit in the contents of the flexible and forward-looking proposal. We hope that the Conference will have an opportunity to deliver on the proposal.

I also take this opportunity to warmly welcome the distinguished Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the People’s Republic of China as the next President of the Conference on Disarmament. I felt encouraged to listen to his constructive suggestions on breaking the impasse in the work of the Conference.

We believe that under the current disposition it is indeed a propitious time to deliver on our mandate on the basis of the consensual approach that is the hallmark of this Conference. My delegation would extend our fullest support in moving towards achieving our shared objectives in this single multilateral disarmament negotiation forum.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much, Ambassador. General statements have concluded and we shall now examine more closely items 5, 6 and 7. The delegations of the United States and Belarus are on the list of speakers. However, before giving them the floor, I would like to recall that we had the opportunity of broaching these items more generally on 17 February, under the presidency of Canada.

Regarding agenda item 5 concerning the new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, including radiological weapons, there have been interesting comments on the need to reflect on such weapons from a broader standpoint than a purely military one. Reference was made to weapons of mass destruction and the need to monitor scientific and technological development and the spread of information and communication technologies, or ITCs. General Assembly resolutions 65/41 and 65/74 should be kept in mind, as they refer to developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security, preventing the acquisition by terrorists of radioactive sources, and the role of science and technology in the context of security and disarmament.

All the scientific and technological advances and the greater ease of access to such technology, which need to be seriously and urgently examined, are linked to the development of new weapons of mass destruction, radiological weapons and other types of weapons. We should also reflect, as indicated in resolution 65/41, on real and potential

threats in the area of information security, and we should consider how to approach these challenges from the perspective of prevention.

Item 6 — a comprehensive disarmament programme — could be useful in identifying new themes on disarmament and security which require urgent attention and action on the part of the Conference, with a view to an adaptive stance on international security.

The significance of item 7 — transparency in armaments — was evident in the idea of reinforcing measures to foster trust. Reference was also made to General Assembly resolution 64/48 on the arms trade treaty and the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. Further concerns were voiced relating to terrorism. This theme is also connected to examining new weapons of mass destruction and the danger of non-State groups gaining access to them.

We must consider General Assembly resolution 65/62 on measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction.

I invite you to expand the debate on agenda items 5, 6 and 7 with a view eventually to appointing special coordinators to gather States' opinions and suggestions on those topics.

I now give the floor to Ambassador Laura Kennedy, Permanent Representative of the United States.

Ms. Kennedy (United States of America): I did indeed prepare a lengthy statement on agenda item 7, Transparency, because, indeed, two aspects of this general topic, transparency and armaments, are of great interest and importance to the United States and, we believe, many other countries. Specifically, I'd like to address the United Nations Standardized Instrument for Reporting Military Expenditures and the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. Now, I have a prepared statement which is quite lengthy and detailed, so I thought perhaps we could just circulate that in view of the number of speakers today and continue, of course, this topic in future sessions because, indeed, it is, as all the ones are, certainly meriting real thought and consideration.

If I might, Mr. President, however, I did want to make remarks directed at representatives of two great countries represented here, your own country, Chile, and Japan. My Secretary of State, Hillary Rodham Clinton, opened her recent address to the Conference with a tribute to your leadership specifically, Ambassador Oyarce, and your efforts to make the Conference on Disarmament an effective tool for addressing the critical challenges we face today. I won't of course sum up her address again, although to note that, indeed, she sought very much to strike a note of urgency. Several speakers today have commented on the importance of the goal of reaching a world without nuclear weapons and, indeed, we continue to believe very strongly that negotiating a fissile material cut-off treaty is an essential step as part of that broad international effort to make progress towards that goal.

Let me reiterate now, however, one particular point of her speech, and that is, again, her very laudatory assessment of you and your presidency, Ambassador Oyarce. We all know what a challenge this job has become, and you met that challenge admirably. We appreciate the efforts you made to develop a programme of work, the deft way you managed your plenary duties and the vigorous debate you stimulated. Your efforts to arrange our very own "high-level segment" attracted a record number of global actors, including my own boss, so many thanks for all that you and your team have done to try to galvanize this body into action.

Let me also say we look forward at this point with equal enthusiasm to the Chinese presidency under the very distinguished hand of our colleague, Wang Qun. We listened to

his statement with great interest today, as we did all of those delivered today and, of course, will reflect on them.

I would also now like to turn to the issue that has been so much on our minds and that is Japan, and I would like to say that I have received an absolute barrage of requests from former Conference colleagues and many friends of Japan asking me to convey their special prayers to our dear colleague, Ambassador Suda, and his delegation. The ferocity of this disaster has stunned us all. While governments, including my own, and friends around the world are sending aid to Japan, we all know the greatest resource that Japan has is its people, who we know will rise above even this terrible catastrophe.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much, Ambassador Kennedy. I give the floor to Ambassador Mikhail Khvostov, Permanent Representative of Belarus.

Mr. Khvostov (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to convey through our colleague and friend Ambassador Suda our sincere condolences to the people of Japan in the wake of the devastating earthquake, claiming many human lives and causing nuclear reactors to malfunction.

The world was shaken 25 years ago by the tragic Chernobyl accident and Belarus was the first to confront its most dreadful consequences. We are confident that with assistance from the international community Japan will prevent a worst-case scenario.

Mr. President, we greatly appreciate the work you have done as President of the Conference and note your efforts to lead substantive thematic discussions on the agenda items of the Conference and endeavours to adopt a balanced programme of work of this body.

We will not be making a general comment. However, I would like to note that we associate ourselves with the statements made by the representatives of China and the Russian Federation. We agree with the assessment of the work of the Conference expressed in the statements, particularly the promising proposals that were made. We also consider that we have no choice other than to continue to work hard within the Conference on tackling the issues that we have raised.

While it is true that we have already previously discussed agenda items 5 and 7, I hope you will forgive me if I return to item 5.

We have already put forward some ideas in our statement on 17 February on ways to prevent the emergence of new weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, and stressed the need for a preventive approach to the issue. The statements of a number of delegations on the misuse of information technology have helped to advance the debate on this issue. We are convinced that cyberattacks, which have become more frequent, better organized and more damaging to States, could reach levels that threaten national and regional stability. A number of significant technology trends verge on having a serious global effect on the security of States. These principles are already recognized in the new strategic frameworks of military and political organizations in Europe. In this regard, we are in favour of further adapting the work of the Conference to new challenges and threats, indeed without prejudice to the substantive work of the Conference on the four key items on the agenda.

Today, we would like to draw attention to the following.

We believe that the rules of international humanitarian law should be applied in the context of national efforts to prohibit weapons of mass destruction. It is a well-established and indisputable fact that the use of weapons of mass destruction would constitute a flagrant violation of all fundamental principles of international humanitarian law given the consequences entailed. Moreover, I would like to point out that the development of new

weapons of mass destruction is a violation of these principles. In particular, Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 requires a High Contracting Party to conduct a national assessment of whether new types of weapons, including weapons of mass destruction, are compatible with the rules of international humanitarian law.

Article 36 of the Protocol requires States in the study, development, acquisition or adoption of a new weapon or method of warfare to determine whether they would be prohibited by the Protocol or by any other rule of international law.

In this regard, we attach great importance to compliance with all the provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and Additional Protocols thereto by all States parties and universalization of these international legal instruments.

I would also like to focus briefly on agenda item 7, "Transparency in armaments".

We believe that greater transparency in armaments would do much to promote greater trust and mutual security among States. Belarus has provided information to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms every year since 1993. We consider the Register to be an important step towards promoting transparency in military matters. In this regard, we fully support the meeting of the Group of Governmental Experts that will be held in 2012 to review the current functioning and further development of the Register.

We also believe that a prerequisite for transparency in armaments is effective interaction with States represented in United Nations entities, especially entities responsible for monitoring compliance with Security Council resolutions on arms embargoes. Unfortunately, it must be said that such cooperation does not always properly exist and we have seen cases recently of false information being spread egregiously and unacceptably by people in the secretariat.

In this regard, United Nations entities must be extremely responsible when disseminating information affecting the interests of States through the media, particularly on issues concerning embargoes.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much, Ambassador. I give the floor to the Acting Representative of Iran, Mr. Daryaei.

Mr. Daryaei (Islamic Republic of Iran): On behalf of my country, let me begin by expressing our heartfelt condolences and sympathy to the Government and people of Japan for the tragic event of the tsunami. The event and the degree of the devastation and damage to the Japanese people and resources were indeed shocking. May God bless the soul of those who lost their lives and give strength and patience to those who lost their families and relatives.

Mr. President, I would also like to thank you for your diligent efforts during the presidency over this august body. We really appreciate your transparent and inclusive manner. I would like also to appreciate the wise statement that we have heard from the distinguished Ambassador of China, elaborating the importance of the Conference as the sole negotiation body.

Now, I would like to turn to the agenda items that are the main focus for this plenary meeting. It is a bitter reality that the illicit arms trade has negative consequences upon innocent people. The Islamic Republic of Iran, being aware of the consequences and effects of illicit arms trade upon innocent people, principally welcomes all attempts leading to preventing and eradicating illicit arms trade. Iran is of the view that such a lofty goal aimed at realization of international and regional peace and security could be attained only in the light of serious international cooperation. Moreover, Iran believes that multilateralism is the core principle of negotiation in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation aimed at promoting international peace and security.

We reaffirm the sovereign and inherent right of States to acquire, manufacture, export, import and retain conventional arms for their self-defence and security needs in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. Any arrangement for the regulation of conventional armaments should be in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. A tremendous effort has already been made by the international community in the conclusion of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, which was adopted by consensus in the 2001 United Nations Conference. It then further improved later. All of these efforts, which represent a multilateral progressive approach, should not be abandoned and overlooked. Regretfully, the provisions of the plan of action have not been fully implemented and duly supported by certain major exporters of such weapons. Therefore, in our view, the international community needs the full implementation of the plan of action rather than creating a new mechanism or documents.

In our view resolution 46/36, as the basis of the whole initiative and the main term of reference for transparency in armaments, has not been fully and faithfully implemented. The increase in military expenditure is alarming today. The direct consequences of this issue are imposed on the ordinary people everywhere to deprive them of a better life standard, welfare and better education for their children. In our view, the main term of reference for transparency in armaments has not been fully and faithfully implemented. We announced our position that transparency in conventional arms without transparency in weapons of mass destruction is imbalanced, insufficient and lacks comprehensiveness.

A need for a universal legally binding treaty prohibiting the development and manufacture of new weapons of mass destruction was discussed here at the Conference many times. The need has also been reconfirmed by the adoption of the United Nations General Assembly resolution prohibiting the development and manufacture of weapons of mass destruction. That shows the necessity to review periodically the utilization of growth of technology in development of new weapons of mass destruction by some countries. The powerful countries use the influence of scientific and technological advancement as an inventive tool for the design of new types of weapons of mass destruction. These weapons cause the same serious indiscriminate effects against innocent people as the already prohibited weapons of mass destruction. We believe that the root cause for illegality and illegitimacy of the already prohibited weapons of mass destruction is also valid for the new types of weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, it is an urgent need to adopt some preventive measures to alleviate this concern from the international community. The international community should consider the elaboration of such a legally binding instrument before production of these new weapons of mass destruction becomes rampant. The Conference on Disarmament is the most appropriate forum for the discussion of the definition of new weapons of mass destruction and reviewing the new categories of weapons of mass destruction that fit this definition.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Many thanks to the Acting Representative of Iran.

We have come to the end of the examination of items 5, 6 and 7. Before ending the session, I would like to make some closing remarks.

At the beginning of Chile's presidency, we presented a tentative timetable of activities which looked at exchanging ideas on the programme of work and included a focused discussion on all the agenda items as well as a high-level meeting. During this period, we have also made efforts to reconcile opinions on the programme of work. To conclude our presidency, we would like to refer briefly to those topics and then conclude with more general thoughts.

First, in our opinion, the high-level meeting was positive, with statements by ministers of foreign affairs, other officials and, for the first time, the President of the General Assembly. As has been recalled, we received clear messages that emphasized the value of the Conference — which is very important — but that also warned that the current situation had to improve if the forum is to fulfil its negotiating mandate.

Secondly, a new round of debates was conducted, focused on all the agenda items, which enabled the Conference to once again identify the concerns and various positions, in particular in respect of the four core issues.

Thirdly, during the first plenary meeting there was an exchange of ideas on a programme of work, with a view to ascertaining the positions of the member States of the Conference on Disarmament and identifying potential elements for inclusion in the programme. We have had very useful and constructive discussions and we applaud the interest shown. The plenary exchange provided a clearer picture of the various focus areas, which can be summarized as follows.

First, a programme of work similar to document CD/1864, which has often been described in this room as the gold standard and which has brought us closest to effective work.

Secondly, a simplified programme of work. There does not seem to be a clear idea on how far-reaching the simplification or minimalism should be. However, some believe that the programme of work would be reduced to a mere timetable of activities without mandates.

Thirdly, there was also talk of working without a programme of work. We looked into the practice and there is precedent for it. We tried to identify elements on which to build consensus for a programme of work. On the one hand, there is decision CD/1864 which resulted from a specific political context. It was never implemented and difficulties have persisted since it was approved. On the other hand, a model based on a mere timetable of activities is not acceptable to those members who deem that a programme of work must include one or more mandates.

In an attempt to be as realistic as possible, we looked for middle ground that would enable us to move toward a unanimous solution. We explored options such as a general mandate for four working groups that would be flexible enough to allow the groups to launch various concrete activities based on both the general and focused discussion recently held. This work would range from study of focus areas and substantive debate to negotiations on a legally-binding agreement. We knew that a solution of this kind, based on what we had called constructive ambiguity, could cause issues for those who see decision CD/1864 as the basis for any potential agreement. In their opinion, any programme of work would make negotiating a fissile material cut-off treaty a priority. Therefore any solution that strayed from that would probably be considered a step backward.

We were also aware of the potential impact of a general mandate that did not set different priorities for actions undertaken in each of the four core issues on which opinions diverge. Notwithstanding these apprehensions, we have suggested ideas that would provide the Conference with a programme of work for starting substantive work, all the while leaving open the possibility of entering into negotiations on a fissile materials cut-off treaty. In the current context, I hope that this will give a political boost to future discussion on a programme of work. We believe the discussion must continue in that direction. Reality has led us to the conclusion that a general mandate covering all items does not appear acceptable. Nor is there consensus on a distinct mandate like that in decision CD/1864. Due to persistent mutually exclusive positions, it is impossible to overcome such differences at this stage. Unfortunately, I am forced to admit that existing limitations to determining a

programme of work are real, but I believe it is the duty of the president, as well as the responsibility of the Conference, to make a serious effort to do so.

Of course it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, at this juncture to find common ground or a basis for agreement among members of the Conference on Disarmament. That is why we did not present these ideas in a formal document. Our intention was to introduce new elements into the discussion surrounding the programme of work. Thus, I wanted to share our thoughts with the member States in a transparent manner, in the shape of a non-paper. We hope that the next presidency will be able to continue efforts on this central topic.

Under these circumstances, it seems appropriate to make a few suggestions. First, we need to recognize the true problem inherent to the Conference and which should be broached in the near future, that is, whether the political resolve to move toward negotiation can only be created outside the Conference or whether it can be fostered within the Conference. A degree of interaction between the two levels, endogenous and exogenous, will probably be necessary as a decisive catalyst for the future work of this forum. We need tangible political signs.

Secondly, we should reflect on the concept of negotiation. Negotiation is an obligation inherent upon each of us in this Conference, but it is the prerogative of a sovereign State to decide whether or not it will adhere to an agreement arising from a negotiation, subject to its legitimate national interests. The key, as was stated earlier, is not to fear negotiation.

Thirdly, we should also reflect on the future of the Conference within this forum, before another body does it for us. Multilateral institutions have been moving forward, so the Conference likely faces the added challenge of aligning itself with the current international state of affairs in order to accommodate the security interests of all States. We could agree on a way to proceed with this reflection that would ensure inclusiveness and transparency. We can all appreciate that it is not only a question of the forum but also of political and strategic circumstances that should not escape our attention.

Fourthly, we must use the current momentum, both inside and outside the Conference on Disarmament, to continue our thematic work in a more focused manner, despite known limitations.

Fifthly, our task should be to look into a practical method for timely, effective and necessary interaction between the Conference and the Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters on the topic of revitalizing the Conference. This is a key issue, in the presidency's opinion, and we should avoid unnecessary procedural debates about the relevance of this exchange. We recall that the Advisory Board will be holding a session in Geneva in July.

Sixthly, we need to keep a record of opinions expressed by member and observer States during the general discussions and focus groups held under the Canadian, Chilean and future presidencies. In our opinion, this material could be useful when we embark on our task of substantive negotiation. That is the point of focused discussions.

Seventhly, the Conference should assess the value of continuing to discuss ways of improving the effectiveness of the Conference's work. I met with the informal group of observer States to the Conference on Disarmament aspiring to membership. Their concern is that, contrary to article 2 of the regulations, which stipulates that Conference membership should be reviewed at regular intervals, the membership has not been reconsidered since 2002. They expressed their interest in appointing a special coordinator, which in the group's opinion would allow a more structured study of the matter without prejudice to the findings. I would like to recall three concepts: multilateralism, universality and collective

security. We must be clear on the significance of these concepts and examine them from a political point of view.

Eighthly, we should look into methodology. We have already mentioned an appropriate method for analysing civil society contributions to the Conference. The method should be compatible with our negotiation mandate. Thus, it would be helpful to consider the practice of United Nations bodies and other intergovernmental forums.

I would like to conclude my observations by restating the potential of this Conference for real impact on global security if its mandate as a negotiating body is put into practice. We must accept once and for all that human security, national security and global security are all interdependent. Global security is the key to lasting national and human security.

Before closing the meeting, I would like to thank member and observer States for their support to the presidency and their contribution to our work, and to express our gratitude for the help received from our P-6 colleagues and regional coordinators. We would also like to thank the Secretary-General of the Conference and the Under-Secretary-General, Jarmo Sareva, who is here with us today, as well as political attachés and members of the secretariat sitting behind me; you have guided us with your advice, professionalism, caution and great political acumen.

I would also like to thank the interpreters for helping us understand one another better, and the conference officers for making it easier for us to work.

I thank the Acting Representative of Chile, Mr. Luciani Parodi, for his tireless commitment and professionalism, a complex task in a two-person delegation.

I wish the Ambassador of China the best of luck on his upcoming presidency. My friend, I am certain that you will guide us with your culture's traditional wisdom.

I apologize for any missteps; I was driven solely by the desire to stoke the vitality of the Conference.

I now give the floor to the Representative of China, Ambassador Wang Qun.

Mr. Wang Qun (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has noted the tireless efforts you have made during your tenure as President to move the work of the Conference forward. We admire the openness and transparency you have shown in positively conducting the discussions by the member States of each of the agenda items, while at the same time continuing an open discussion of the work of the Conference, ensuring a favourable atmosphere for the next stage in its work and also thus establishing a favourable foundation on which to build. Personally, I have learned a great deal in observing your efforts and ways of working. Mr. President, you just expressed the wish that China, in taking over the presidency, will keep up these efforts, and will continue seeking consensus on the core issue of the Conference's programme of work. As successor to the presidency of the Conference, China will continue cooperating closely with you and others, including by working steadfastly on questions including the Conference's programme of work, so that we may together advance its endeavours.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much, Ambassador. I give the floor to the Acting Representative of Malaysia, Ms. Siti Hajjar Adnin.

Ms. Adnin (Malaysia): Malaysia has the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the Group of 21 in the Conference on Disarmament.

At the outset the Group would like to express our profound condolences and sympathy to the people and the Government of Japan over the recent devastating

earthquake and tsunami. Our prayers and thoughts are with the families of the victims and those affected by the disaster.

Mr. President, the Group takes pride in seeing our fellow member of the G-21 presiding over the Conference. We wish to express our sincere appreciation for the exemplary manner in which you and your delegation have been leading the Conference.

The Group would also like to express our sincere appreciation for your dedication and tireless efforts in conducting informal consultations with member States to seek common ground in order to bring the Conference back to substantive work. The Group is confident that your hard work will pave the way for further positive developments in the Conference.

The Group is fully committed to extending its cooperation to Ambassador Wang, the incoming President, and all the 2011 session Presidents during their respective presidencies. In this regard, the Group encourages the 2011 Presidents to continue consultations on a programme of work with a view to forge consensus.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much for your kind words. I give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Colombia, Ambassador Arango Olmos.

Ms. Arango Olmos (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to thank the delegation of Chile, and you in particular, Ambassador, for your efforts and work over the past four weeks which Colombia has been able to follow very closely. I congratulate you on your concluding remarks which were clear and ought to be uppermost in the minds of all those who are part of the Conference.

And to you, Ambassador Wang Qun, I wish to extend my delegation's support and cooperation in future endeavours. We wish you the best of luck on your presidency.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much, Ambassador. I give the floor to the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ambassador So Se Pyong.

Mr. So (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): First of all, I have to also join the Ambassadors who expressed deep concern on the catastrophe and natural disaster in Japan and also the expression of their sympathy and condolences to the people and Government of Japan.

So, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's delegation joins the other delegations to associate itself with the appreciation stressed by Malaysia on behalf of the G-21. Mr. President, it is the view of my delegation that during your presidency you have tried a lot for the progress of the Conference, particularly for the programme of work, totally devoting your good self to make it further forward. Not only your contribution, but also your transparent and inclusive manner of your working style, your conduct, were very impressionable and gave us good impetus. In particular, the non-paper you have faxed to every member State obviously shows your effort, since it may be regarded as the realistic and substantial contribution to the work of the Conference. In this regard, my delegation will study further in detail to try to find out some positive possibilities which can facilitate the progress of work under the rules of procedure. Taking this opportunity, once again expressing appreciation, I wish you all the best and great success in your discharge of high office in the years ahead.

And, in conclusion, I also take this opportunity to highlight the sincere expectation of my delegation that the forthcoming presidency of China will also lead to the Conference work to push it forward much more, mobilizing your excellent capacity of leadership and demonstrating his hard-working spirit during his presidency. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is ready to cooperate with the new presidency and support the President.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much. I give the floor to Ambassador Himanen, Permanent Representative of Finland.

Mr. Himanen (Finland): At this hour, I have no intention to prolong the meeting, but let me make a couple of brief remarks. First of all, in my current role as the coordinator of the Group of Western European and Other States, I would wish to express our deepest condolences and warm sympathy through Ambassador Suda and the Japanese delegation to the people and Government of Japan at this hour of the tragic and unprecedented natural calamity.

On a more personal note, Mr. President, as you are coming to a close of your presidency, so I also will be relinquishing my role as coordinator of the Western Group. I have personally enjoyed our close and excellent cooperation with you and your team and appreciate the hard work you have done in the conduct of the business of the Conference and your efforts to come to an agreement on a programme of work.

Under my national hat, as Finland, let me reiterate what my Foreign Minister said in his statement during the high-level segment of the Conference: "The swift resumption of negotiations would ... allow the Conference to regain its authority before it is too late for it to do so ... [Members] of the Conference must shoulder their responsibility and launch real negotiations." In that vein, Mr. President, I listened very carefully to your statement and express my appreciation for your non-paper containing ideas for possible elements for a programme of work for the 2011 session. I believe your ideas deserve the full attention of delegations.

In conclusion, Mr. President, while thanking you, I wish all the best for the incoming president, Ambassador Wang of China, and assure him of my delegation's full support in his duties.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much, Ambassador. I give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Brazil, Ambassador Macedo Soares.

Mr. Macedo Soares (Brazil): The Japanese and Brazilian societies are intertwined. Several hundred thousands of Brazilian citizens are of Japanese origin, fruit of immigration in the last 100 years that brought tremendous benefits for both countries and truly for Brazil. And hundreds of thousands of Brazilians live and work in Japan. So, in this moment, millions of Brazilians that have relatives and friends living in Japan are feeling the anguish and the solidarity with the moment through which Japan is passing. Thinking of the risks Japan and the world face as a consequence of this catastrophe, we cannot refrain from thinking on the threat posed by nuclear weapon stockpiles. So, as I did yesterday at the Japanese Mission, I renew my condolences, my sympathy and that of my delegation to my colleague Akio Suda.

(continues in Spanish)

Mr. President, your words bring to a close the Chilean presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. I cannot express my delegation's wish that your presidency continue because I also look forward to the presidency of China, especially after hearing the breadth, scope and wisdom of the remarks made today, as on previous occasions, by my colleague and friend Ambassador Wang.

Among many other things, Mr. President, you got us working. As you mentioned, many officials have attended and delegations have made many comprehensive statements. We are here to negotiate but before we do, in order to get to that point, we must speak, and more importantly, listen to one another. Speaking and listening, at least as far as I am concerned, are work, they are not a "hobby". Those who say that the Conference needs to get back to work apparently do not consider what we do as work.

You have presented us a non-official paper, a non-paper, containing very good ideas for which we are grateful. If I were to make one criticism, it would be that you did not turn this “non-paper” into a document, as had my delegation and that of Belarus, since it would contribute to documenting the evolution of the debate within the Conference. In the many, let us say more than 10, years in which we have failed to approve a programme of work, except in 2009, many proposals have been made and recorded in Conference documents which can be referred to and looked to for inspiration.

I believe — and I can say as much because the delegation of Brazil, although not the only such delegation, is open to proposals and does not merely take hard-line positions — that if the draft programme of work in document CD/1864 were presented today, my delegation would undoubtedly support it as it did two years ago. However it is important that we do not balk at a proposal that has attained consensus but not been implemented. To contend that the programme of work must use the words of CD/1864 perhaps is not conducive to moving forward. We ought to keep an open mind to other possibilities which do not necessarily contradict that or other prior proposals.

Your proposal would therefore be of great use, as it already has been. It is perhaps not a gold standard, if we are to use your predecessor’s classification, but it may be a metal of equal usefulness and value.

Lastly, I would say that, among other items discussed today, you and other delegations have mentioned the issue of Conference membership review which has been raised before. In our work, that is, the dialogue that unfolds within the Conference, the matter is on the table and should be pursued.

I wish to thank you once again, Mr. President, for the way in which you have presided. There is no need for further epithets because the discussions we have had are a testament to the success of your presidency, which shall no doubt be carried on by the Chinese presidency under the excellent leadership of Ambassador Wang Qun and his team.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Many thanks, Ambassador. I give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Ecuador, Ambassador Mauricio Montalvo.

Mr. Montalvo (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to express to the Ambassador of Japan, as have other delegations, our compassion for his Government and people for the natural disasters and knock-on effects which have battered Japan and its entire population in recent days.

Naturally, Ecuador endorses the declaration formulated on behalf of the Group of 21 and, in its national capacity, wishes to add the following. Ecuador, at the high-level meeting held in New York in September 2010, expressed its hope that instead of remaining in the impasse in which the Conference on Disarmament has been mired for the past decade, a strengthened and revitalized forum would emerge that met 21st century expectations and where issues could be broached efficiently, within a modern multilateral system. In keeping with this position, we have always supported the formulation of a coherent, balanced and comprehensive programme of work for the Conference on Disarmament that includes all the agenda items and would end the long period of lethargy which is inadmissible and unjustifiable at this level, the more so in that the rule of consensus has been abused, a rule that, as has been repeated countless times, should be invoked responsibly.

For this reason, we have paid particular attention to your presentation, Ambassador Oyarce, as president of the Conference, and we thank and congratulate you for your determination and initiative. We think that your proposal, which you call “constructive ambiguity”, is flexible yet comprehensive enough to lead the Conference on Disarmament on what we believe is the right path and to return to substantive and constructive work. We believe that at the very least it should be given a chance and be discussed and examined in

future plenary meetings of the Conference, an opportunity we trust the new president, the distinguished Ambassador and Permanent Representative of China, to whom we extend our welcome and complete support, will seize.

Therefore, we endorse the spirit and intention of your approach, the important elements and suggestions contained in your non-paper, and the allocution you made a few minutes ago. We wish to conclude with a thought from our national perspective. For Ecuador, as we have stated many times at this forum, the road to peace is not through nuclear weapons or the obsolete theory of nuclear deterrence, but rather through what we, or in the words of an illustrious Ecuadorian, call “the disarmament of conscience”. It is part and parcel of the road to peace in a world in which the principles of development, justice, equality, the fight against poverty, respect for human rights, non-aggression and cooperation must prevail. Our greatest wish is for the Conference to head in that direction, within the confines of its scope and remit, to embark on its work with sincerity and intellectual integrity, and to realize these lofty goals.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you, Ambassador. I give the floor to the Acting Permanent Representative of Mexico, Ambassador Arturo Hernández Basave.

Mr. Hernández Basave (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much, Mr. President. The people of Mexico, via the President of Mexico and our highest authorities around the world, have already extended Mexico’s condolences and compassion to the people and Government of Japan. But there are occasions when words are inadequate and I would like to ask distinguished Ambassador Suda to convey the people of Mexico’s warmest and most brotherly embrace to the people of Japan in these tragic times.

I believe the nuclear accident at Fukushima can provide us a few lessons. Although this accident stems from peaceful use of nuclear energy, there are now justified fears in various parts of the world which perceive a threat to the national security of various States, and surely to the human security of millions of people on the planet.

There are fears that the radiation, although contained locally within the borders of Japan, could seriously affect the lives and health of thousands of people and that the food chain, not only in Japan but also regionally and globally, as well as the world economy, may be affected by these regrettable events. I raise this issue so that we may think about possible consequences of the deliberate and wilful use of nuclear energy for belligerent, military, aggressive, criminal or terrorist ends. Let us imagine the consequences of such use of nuclear energy. They would in every regard be very severe for the whole of humanity.

The world has changed. Nowadays, civil society in all our countries has matured. There is greater universal awareness of the need to promote and respect human rights, to further human development and quality of life and, why not say it, to seek people’s happiness while we have the opportunity and privilege to enjoy life. We also have greater awareness of the importance of working together to build a peaceful, compassionate world where we can tackle together global phenomena and natural disasters, the likes of which Japan is currently facing but which other countries have also faced recently, such as Indonesia, Haiti, Chile and Mexico. In sum, there is greater awareness of all these things.

We think this may be the time for countries to reflect on notions of national security. We cannot, in a context of increasingly mature countries, perpetuate highly limited views of national security predicated solely on military and aggressive premises or on claims of self-defence against murky threats to specific countries. The international community can most emphatically not fall prey to bilateral, trilateral, regional or subregional problems or become entirely mired in a war or war-preparedness rationale.

Stockpiling of nuclear weapons and the foolhardy reluctance to at least consider their elimination do little but preserve this war rationale with which people are brainwashed

from birth and perpetuate a global chain and mindset of violence. Perhaps accidents such as this will lead us to attempt to promote, think about and take up the cause of changing mindsets and building future generations. Japan itself is a country that encourages education on disarmament and non-proliferation. All this is germane to the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

Perhaps we have been, and will continue to be, unable to move forward in the Conference on Disarmament as long as these limited notions of national security based on military premises prevail and are maintained to the detriment of the importance of promoting the human security of all our citizens, an obligation that is incumbent upon every single country and related to the national security of each and every one of us at the national and global level.

Mexico wishes to express its most sincere thanks for the efforts you have made. We know that it is not easy to save face as diplomats in a forum at which it is nearly impossible to convince people of the need to begin work. You may rest assured, Mr. President, and hold your head high as you leave office, knowing that your dignity and prestige as a diplomat have remained intact. You have made all the efforts professionally and humanly possible. I've had the honour of knowing you for slightly more than a decade; I know your level of commitment and I know that you are a diplomat who not only respects his country's instructions but whose actions also uphold political, social and human ideals and standards. You have discharged your duty in this way and have given us grist for the mill so that we may attain something that ought to be simple, and had been for many years in this forum: approving a programme of work, be it simplified or inclusive of mandates.

As the Ambassador of China and others have already said today, there are important treaties — the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Treaty on non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty — which were negotiated in part or in full by this Conference. The Conference's work came to fruition in these treaties. Those were the years when approving a programme of work was not an issue that concerned us or took up our time. Negotiating was ongoing, work was being done.

With all due respect, we do not agree with the perception of the upcoming president of the Conference, the Ambassador of China, that this is a democratic forum. The abusive use of the rule of consensus, like Russian dolls each concealing a smaller figure, does nothing but hide the improper use of veto rights by every constituent country in this Conference, thereby affecting the national security of the entire world. We cannot move forward.

You have been cooperative and have moved forward; I congratulate and thank you once again. I reiterate Mexico's readiness to begin negotiations and express the hope that the rule of consensus shall apply to a negotiated treaty we wish to see reach consensus — or not — but not to something as basic as a programme of work. It is not worthy of us as diplomats, nor worthy of our people and countries.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Many thanks, Ambassador, for your thoughts, friendship and kind words. I offer the floor to Ambassador Hoffman, Permanent Representative of Germany.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): Mr. President, I thought it appropriate to make a few comments on where I think we stand in the Conference only after we had heard your own assessment at the end of your own presidency, but before I come to that, I would, of course, join colleagues in expressing deepest condolences and sympathy and support to the delegation of Japan and the people of Japan on the enormous tragedy which has hit this country and which is still unfolding.

This week, the second Conference presidency of the 2011 session comes to a close. Now, what has happened in the first seven weeks of this session? I regret to say, with regard to the actual or real task given to us, that is to say, to negotiate instruments in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, we have not made progress. We have not made any progress on the programme of work. I believe it is fair to say that we have, in fact, continued to move even further away from achieving consensus on what we want to do compared to where we had been in mid- and late 2009, when we had a programme of work in place and quarrelled about how exactly to implement it.

Now, I return to the question which I asked at the outset: what has happened in the first seven weeks, then? What have we done? What have we achieved? Let us take a sober look: I see two elements. Number one: we have heard a very significant number of statements on the core issues which have been on our agenda for many decades. Actually, I counted them: including statements by the Presidents and the Secretary-General, we heard, if my counting is correct, 277 statements in 16 meetings, some of which took place in the mornings and in the afternoon. This does not include today's statements; 277 in seven weeks.

For those who have joined, or have been involved in the Conference a bit longer, like myself — before I came here I was already involved in Conference work — listening to these statements was a lot of *déjà vu*, not only in terms of the substance of the statements, but also in terms of staging thematic debates when one cannot agree on what the Conference should actually work on in terms of substance. The Conference has been there many times before. But let me also say the positive impression I take away from this wave of statements, in particular by high-ranking representatives, is the concerted call for the Conference to get down to starting its substantive work. And I would have to say here, I certainly regard also discussions and the preparations of statements for such discussions as work, I can assure our colleague from Brazil, but this is not really the task which we were given, to only discuss, and everybody knows that, of course.

Now, what is the second element I see which we could observe in these last seven weeks? We had a side event over three afternoons on FMCT — a side event, but of course, one can bring it up here and it has been brought up here, which led to interesting discussions about some basic questions with the active participation of some experts. My delegation welcomes this activity, allowing us to focus our minds on a topic which, as far as we are concerned, we would like to start to negotiate on immediately. Now, the host of the side event has pointed out repeatedly that these discussions did not, and I quote him here, “represent a negotiation, nor a pre-negotiation, but an opportunity to exchange views”. As I said, we welcome this opportunity, and we try to make our modest contribution. Now, of course, one hopes that events like these will build confidence and mutual trust, taking us to a point where we can, in fact, agree on a programme of work and/or start our real work. But let us be honest with ourselves. Is this going to happen? I think the least one would have to say is this: the jury is still very much out. So let us not pretend that just because we have heard 277 statements in seven weeks, we are on the way forward in the Conference.

And finally a word of warm thanks to you, Mr. President, and I listened very carefully to your statement. Regarding the programme of work, let me say that it is not your fault that even with your skills the solution to how to square the circle could not be found. Given the contradictory pressures from various sides and the fixed positions taken so far, it is in actual fact practically impossible to come to an agreement on the programme of work. And the task is not helped either by the fact that the process is of a nature that even for insiders, it is not easy to see who blocks exactly what. So let me thank you very much for making another committed effort and for the excellent way in which you have conducted your presidency. Our task remains and waits for an answer. We must find out what we

actually want to do in this body, and I call upon the incoming presidency of China, of Ambassador Wang, to continue to work on this.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much, Ambassador. I give the floor to the Acting Representative of Indonesia, Ms. Djajaprawira.

Ms. Djajaprawira (Indonesia): Mr. President, my delegation would like to associate with the statement made on behalf of the G-21, and allow me to join the others in congratulating you for your hard work and efforts to move the Conference forward and always believe that on your able guidance and expertise, we will be able to arrive at successful deliberations. And I would also like to commend your efforts, among others, conducting successful deliberations on substantive issues in the Conference plenary, facilitating the presence of some dignitaries to address the Conference and circulating a non-paper on possible elements for the programme of work for the 2011 session as food for thought. And Ambassador Wang, as the next President of the Conference – please rest assured that my delegation will render support to you and wish you success in this endeavour.

For the past few years we have joined consensus on a programme of work as contained in document CD/1864, even though it is not yet a perfect one, and we have also lent our support for a draft decision on a programme of work as contained in document CD/1889. And in this context, we would like to reiterate our full support for the P-6 efforts and encourage the current P-6 to submit proposals on a programme of work and conduct consultations on it. For our part, we stand ready to continue consultations on all proposals which aim to foster consensus on a programme of work.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much. I give the floor to the Permanent Representative of India, Ambassador Rao.

Mr. Rao (India): In view of the lateness of the hour, I will be very brief. I wish to begin by conveying our deepest condolences to Ambassador Suda and the members of the delegation of Japan at this moment of immense great tragedy in Japan. My Prime Minister has written to Prime Minister Kan telling him that India stands in full solidarity with the people of Japan and that our resources are at the disposal of Japan for any assistance they may require. We can never forget that India has been the largest recipient of Japan's overseas development assistance, and our prayers and thoughts are with Japan during this most horrific disaster.

Mr. President, this is the last plenary under your leadership. I want to place on record our sincere appreciation for the manner in which you have discharged your responsibilities. Your presidency has been marked by inclusiveness, transparency and diligence. We applaud your efforts in trying to bring the Conference closer to commencement of negotiations. I should also like to extend my full cooperation and support to the incoming President, my friend Ambassador Wang Qun of China, and we look forward to working closely with him in the weeks ahead.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much, Ambassador. I give the floor to the Acting Representative of Syria, Mr. Al Nuqari.

Mr. Al Nuqari (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, my delegation would like to associate itself with the statement made by Malaysia on behalf of the Group of 21.

We would also like to express our deep sorrow at the tragic consequences of the natural disasters that have befallen Japan and the loss of life and property that they entailed. We would also like to express our sympathy and send our condolences to the people and Government of Japan. We are fully confident that the will, determination and noble character for which the Japanese people is known will enable it to emerge from this ordeal.

We would also like to express our gratitude and appreciation for the way in which you have guided our work, and for your persistent efforts to bring the Conference out of its stalemate. We believe that your non-paper represents an attempt to bring the Conference out of this stalemate and takes into consideration all of the views made known in the Conference on starting substantive work. Moreover, it addresses all four core issues in an even-handed and balanced manner. In any case, this non-paper makes new proposals which, if addressed in a positive manner, could bring us out of the vicious circle in which we are turning. We therefore hope that it will constitute the basis for our deliberations towards the adoption of a programme of work for the Conference.

Lastly, we would like to express our appreciation to the Ambassador and delegation of China, the incoming presidency of the Conference on Disarmament.

The President: Thank you very much. I give the floor to Ambassador Suda, Permanent Representative of Japan.

Mr. Suda (Japan): I would like to express again the deep appreciation and gratitude of my delegation to all delegates here who have expressed the warm words and condolences and sense of solidarity extended to the Japanese people, and I assure you that I will certainly convey these words to the Japanese people and I assure you they all encourage Japanese people to come back from this natural disaster.

I would like to also express my deep gratitude to you, Ambassador Oyarce, for your very productive way of presiding this Conference meeting, leading substantial discussions on many issues and also giving us some basis for further consultation on the future of the Conference. I was also very much impressed by your last statement. Particularly I can associate with these eight points you mentioned in the last part of your statement, but even more I was impressed by your message at the end of your statement. I quote: "We have to realize that human security, national security and global security are interdependent. As a matter of fact, global security is the key to lasting national and human security." I strongly concur with this view and the point of the importance. If we are talking about only our own national security, we would never reach any stage of the negotiation on any instrument which would make the world safer. So I think the Conference exists for the very purpose of discussing and negotiating instruments or ways to make the world safer, taking into account national security and international security as well. Particularly important is human security, particularly in relation to nuclear weapons. So, I appreciate your last statement very much and thank you very much for your hard work and your staff to work in presiding and conducting the very successful presidency in the past four weeks, and my delegation certainly looks forward to working with all other delegates under the presidency of China with my friend, Ambassador Wang Qun.

The President (spoke in Spanish): Thank you, Ambassador. We once again convey, on behalf of the Conference, our compassion to the people of Japan.

Thank you all.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.