

Algeria
Mr. Hamza Khelif
Conference on Disarmament
24 May 2011
Unofficial Transcript

Thank you very much, Mr. President. The delegation of Algeria did not want to take the floor. However, in view of the statements of all distinguished delegates on the programme of work we would like to raise some queries on the subject but before that I would like to reaffirm that Algeria is always keen to reiterate the importance of the CD being the sole multilateral body on disarmament.

Algeria has already made a number of proposals before including the proposal of 2001 and 2002 P5 in document CD/1864. Unfortunately all of the attempts that were made before did not allow for the CD to make any further steps ahead.

Naturally Algeria still supports the proposal of 2009 that is to say document CD/1864 as a starting point. As a starting point I repeat to launching the work of CD on the four core items that are before the CD for consideration. We have listened as well to a number of positions that threaten to resort to other fora outside the CD in order to take decisions related to the work of the CD itself. And here, we wonder. What is the meaning of taking the Conference out of its stalemate? Does this mean to negotiate on one particular item or this kind of maneuvering and delay would also apply to all items on the agenda? Again I say, if we take the CD out of its stalemate does this necessarily mean that we start negotiations or there are other alternatives?

And we have listened in previous meetings the possibility to resort to a simplified programme of work similar to the programmes of work adopted in the 90s that state the establishment of working groups without specific mandates. Here I'm just forwarding this query as well as an idea and in view of the approaches that were applied in recent years. So why don't we involve the approaches that were followed last century in the 80s? Why not? When the programme of work at that point was only a programme of activities in the past, the content of the discussion, the content was basically included in the Annual Report.

As for the establishment of subsidiary organs: That was considered as a separate question, separate from the programme of work and accordingly if there is a consensus then these organs were established. Maybe this formula would allow us to work in the framework of a so called programme of work hoping that we are going to reach a consensus formula that will allow us to initiate negotiations on any other items that are before us.

Regarding the mandate of the CD being a negotiating body, I would like to remind you that any negotiations will take place in the CD or even outside of the CD would need in advance, would need substantive discussions beforehand. Here by way of example I would say that the CD was established in 1978 and did not approve any instrument before 1993. That is to say, long time has elapsed during this period of time. There was no programme of work and there was no ultimatums like today. Either we negotiate or were going to resort to other fora outside of the CD. It seems that we need more patients, more negotiations amongst us in order to find the formula that may receive the convergence of

opinions in order to conserve the CD in order to realise progress because I do not think that resorting to other fora in order to negotiate on fissile material or on the negative security assurances or on the CD or on the question of PAROS.

We do not think that resorting alternative bodies would allow us to find the political, the necessary political base that would allow us to reach international instruments that are effective.

I thank you very much.