

**Algeria**  
**3 June 2010**  
**Conference on Disarmament**  
*Unofficial Transcript*

Thank you Mr. President. I wait until the ambassador of DPRK is present to congratulate him and I would like in the mean time to express my gratitude to the US and to the Russian delegations for having given us the opportunity to listen to ambassadors Antonov and Gottemoeller on the achievement of the New START agreement and I would like through them to address our warm congratulations to the two countries concerned in the hope that this first new step will be followed by others so that we can achieve a world free of nuclear weapons within our lifetime.

Secondly, I would like to pay tribute to ambassador Cabactulan of the Philippines who guided so well the Review Conference that took place in New York and to which I had the privilege to participate. Through his traditional modesty and that of his ambassador present here with us today, he attributed a lot of virtues to many of us that were raising problems sometimes but in fact, his ambassador had played a remarkable role and the Philippines needs to be congratulated by all of us.

Thirdly, I would like to refer to our CD work now to say first that I associate myself with the statement made by Egypt in the name of the G21. My delegation also understands the concerns of Pakistan and we need to make sure that we have everybody on board, because this is a consensus driven organization. I say that, but I think that us, the CD, we have a duty, I would say even an obligation to keep up the positive momentum which we thought we had created last year but by which we were overtaken by others in the field of disarmament. But there is a positive momentum now thanks to the initiatives of several [incomprehensible]. National governments, bilateral agreements, the NPT and I think that we have a responsibility to also contribute to this momentum.

I would like to return to what the distinguished ambassadors of the US and Russia said about the New START agreement. They said that whilst this was a progress of the bilateral level between two key nuclear powers it would have an impact on all of us because it diminishes the threat of conflict within this globalized world. [incomprehensible] I would say that this also applies to a certain extent with respect to the tension on the Korean peninsula. It is not entirely a bilateral issue. If there is a threat of a local conflict involving a nuclear power, it is an issue which is of concern to all of us and I respectfully wish to mention also in this respect, following the comments of the distinguished ambassador of the United States that some regional issues are of concerns to the CD, and of course the Nuclear Weapons Free Zone in the Middle East is an issue that is often discussed here and therefore I would not rule out all the regional issues from our discussion.

Let me get back to the CD. We have a series of obligations. We have a primary obligation which is to adopt a Programme of Work and achieve some progress. It was the ambassador of Brazil who read us some action points from the NPT which incites us and encourages us to do that. I realize that not all of us are members of the NPT here in the CD but still, it is a message and a reminder that we need to pursue our efforts to try and agree on a Programme of Work. We must not give up. We must pursue this effort on a daily basis and if we talk about a possibility of having Informal meetings, that is fine, but we mustn't lose sight of the fact that we have to pursue our efforts on the main focus which is seeking an agreement on a programme of work. This must continue, it must not be postponed until we think that all

conditions will be ideal for this to happen.

On the informal meetings that we could organize in parallel with this main objective, I don't think that there is all that much of a difference. I think that substantially we all agree that we have to respect the programme of work. I haven't heard anybody say that they want to change the Rules of Procedure. This is the bond that unites every single one of us. If we agree to the Rules of Procedure we have, as the ambassador of the United States reminded us, we have seven items that we have been discussing so far as components of the Programme of Work that we could discuss in any manner of an approach, including an informal discussion. There is nothing wrong with discussing these issues and I don't think that there is anybody around in the CD that would disagree. The problem is the way the issue came up; first it was focused on one subject, then there was focus on four subjects. I suggested to the president informally, and didn't feel that he was allergic to this proposal, just to put the seven issues because people are all very preoccupied and rightly so, for national security reasons by having a parallel approach and not putting forward one subject at the expense of the other. I don't see anybody that disagree to have the seven subjects to discuss informally and discuss them even sequentially if necessary, provided that there is a clear calendar to how we will discussing these issues, providing also that there is no disagreement amongst the present presidents and the future presidents. It would only reflect the position of the CD that is sovereign. We decide that we should have a programme, a timetable considering all these issues. It should consider this as a tentative proposal but it would have to be something that any future president would have to go along with. Perhaps, it seems to me that if we put all these seven issues and discuss them, I would advise that we don't go into sub-issues and sub-sub-issues because then we would have to get into the units of the discussion. I suggest that we have the seven issues and we see how we can have coordinators and let them present at the end of the discussion their conclusion on their own responsibility. Let the report of the CD say it was informal discussions in the way it was preceded in the past. I don't see that there should be any problem.

I would like to conclude by saying that we need to remember this is a bridge building exercise. It is not easy for you Mr. President to find a common denominator but we very much appreciate the efforts that you have been extending. We support you, we have confidence in you. We just need to agree now on such an approach and I suggest that perhaps you could prepare, on the basis of what I have just said, a paper that would dispel the sense of discomfort that some of us have expressed. We thank you very much.