



PAKISTAN

PERMANENT MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

56 Rue de Moillebeau, 1211 Geneva Tel: (4122) 749.1930 Fax: (4122) 734.8085

PLEASE CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

STATEMENT
BY
AMBASSADOR MASOOD KHAN
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF PAKISTAN

AT THE

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

Geneva,
17 June 2008

Mr. President,

Since I am taking the floor for the first time under your Presidency, we want to congratulate you on the way you have conducted proceedings of the Conference. We compliment you on the drive, style and sophistication that you and your delegation have brought to the work of the CD.

While addressing this Conference on January 22 this year, the UN Secretary General Ban-ki Moon said that, in setting priorities, CD members were under no constraints as to how to conduct their substantive work, other than to proceed on the basis of consensus. The Secretary General observed that to achieve this objective what we need is "political vision". He wisely said: "Top-level political leadership and cooperation can forge a fresh consensus on future projects."

Mr. President,

Our policy on a Fissile Material Treaty (FMT) has been determined at the highest decision-making level. The National Command Authority (NCA) reiterated last year Pakistan's position in favour of a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty, taking into account the security interests of all states.

A paper CD/1840 was presented by the CD President during informal consultations on March 13, 2008. From our point of view, there was only a minor difference between L.1 of last year and the new paper synthesized this year.

While presenting the paper, it was made clear by the President that it would form the basis for further informal consultations. At that point, we had stated that Pakistan was ready to table its amendments to the paper in accordance with the instructions from the capital. The paper was referred to the capital for examination.

On March 18, the next President of the CD said that CD/1840 was an attempt to integrate "the efforts of each and every CD-member to step up the work of the Conference and gain consensus on the way forward."

On March 27, the CD President said that during the intersessional period consultations on the paper would take place "in the spirit of transparency, flexibility and compromise".

The next CD President, on May 26, told the Conference that: "We now have a declaration, a proposed programme of work, which commands almost complete consensus at this Conference". We understand what may constitute 'consensus' or, for the sake of emphasis, 'complete consensus'; but we have not been able to fully decipher 'almost complete consensus', *almost* qualifying *complete*.

The fact is that nothing has changed since March 13. No engagement to amend or negotiate the text of the paper has yet taken place. The document remains as it was introduced. Not a single comma has been changed, though several substantive and procedural suggestions were indicated by our delegation and other delegations. Our understanding was it was not a take-it-or-leave-it proposal.

The statement on May 26 was followed by a very well-meaning assurance: "... we remain especially open to suggestions any delegation may have on CD 1840 which they, after consultations with others, consider will bring us even closer to consensus." We welcome this mandate to us to initiate consultations on our proposals, without in any sense giving the slightest impression that the six Presidents will abandon their responsibility to forge consensus.

To give credit where it is due, the Presidents held intensive consultations mostly in Geneva. Some have engaged capitals, in some instances at the highest political level. Your country, Mr. President, has been the most active in this regard. The message in these contacts was simple: accept the paper of March 13 as it is. No serious overture has been forthcoming so far to accommodate the known concerns on the paper.

From Islamabad, the response to our interlocutors has been:

- (a) Pakistan would sign any dispensation or mandate that is non-discriminatory;
- (b) Pakistan was proposing that the CD should work on a mandate for a verifiable FMT;
- (c) Pakistan had started an interdepartmental evaluation of the recent draft proposal.

Our substantive concerns about CD/1840 are well known, which are stated in CD/1843. These, inter alia, are:

- A commitment to negotiate a "non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable" fissile missile treaty.
- Creation of space for addressing the question of the existing and future stocks, as it was done in the Shannon report.
- Negotiations on all four core issues – nuclear disarmament, FMT, PAROS, and NSAs.
- Using *ad hoc committees* as mechanisms for negotiations.
- A clear differentiation between the role of the coordinators to facilitate informal discussions and the function of formal CD subsidiary bodies to conduct negotiations in the context of the programme of work.
- The Coordinators have so far worked informally under the authority of the CD Presidents. Their reports have no formal status. Formalization of their role as the CD's subsidiary bodies for the core issues will require open and full-fledged discussions in the CD. This cannot be done indirectly by amalgamating the role of the Coordinators with the proposed programme of work.

Mr. President,

We would also like to briefly address some recurrent themes:

- CD/1840 does not take into account “the interests of all CD members”. It requires some dissection and changes to fit that description.
- We agree that we should commence work in the CD without preconditions. There are three preconditions, which we must remove. First, no negotiations can start if ‘verification’ is part of the mandate. Second, no negotiations can start if ad hoc committees will deal with the four core issues minus FMT. Third, negotiations will take place only on FMT, not on the other three core issues.
- Given the familiar history of FMT since 1993, and especially its recent history, it is abundantly clear that CD/1840 is crafted with a built-in prejudgment about the outcome of discussions and negotiations. The dice is loaded from the start.

Mr. President,

We must bear in mind that negotiations on FMT were started in 1998 on agreed basis and within an agreed programme of work, following hard work of five years to develop and pursue the Shannon mandate. In fact, after the adoption of the decision to start FMT negotiations, one delegation had effusively remarked that “after 40-odd years or so we finally got to this decision”. At that time, commencement of the negotiations was made possible by addressing issues, not sidelining them. We did not interrupt those negotiations.

It would be a mistake to invest our precious time and energy on either the reform of the CD or the search for alternative forums or ways to negotiate an FMT. Our work in the CD is cut out for us within the agreed working methods and parameters.

For our part, Mr. President, we are ready for formal and informal negotiations on a comprehensive and balanced programme of work in a transparent and constructive manner.

I thank you, Mr. President.
