Thank you Mr. President.

Mr. President, before I comment on the working paper distributed by you, I would like to join you first in expressing our condolences to the delegation of Turkey for the recent earthquake in their country. I would also like to welcome the representative of Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom and welcome the statement made by them today. Pakistan has always been in favour of participation of civil society in the work of the CD and this is a very good beginning and we will continue to support such interaction in the future. May I also take this opportunity to convey a belated congratulation to all our lady colleagues for International Women’s Day.

Mr. President, I note that you have in your remarks stated that you would want comments on your working paper to be made at a later time and that you would like us to examine your proposal. I believe that if we were to do so, then the course of action that ought to have been followed was to have shared this working paper informally and not in the formal plenary. But since it has been presented in the formal plenary, it is in the [incomprehensible] on me under my directions from my headquarters to make the following statement:

Mr. President, your working paper CD/WP559 on the proposed programme of work of the conference for the 2010 session contains elements with which we regard to make the following comments:

1. The working paper like the non-paper circulated by you earlier is mainly a copy of CD/1864 which does not enjoy consensus anymore and therefore cannot serve as a starting point. You, as well as your predecessor after consultations have concluded that CD/1864 and the non-paper does not command consensus. While presenting the working paper today, you have again acknowledged that there is no consensus on the text due to different positions. Therefore, the question to our mind is what purpose has been served by putting forward this working paper?

2. The working paper is not balanced. It does not reflect the G21’s proposal to establish an ad hoc committee for deeper negotiations on nuclear disarmament which is the raison d’être of the Conference. We therefore urge you to put forward a working programme on this proposal by the G21. Your working paper has also annulled a number of ideas, proposals that have been presented by the CD members, including Pakistan, during the plenary sessions, informal meetings and bilateral consultations. It does therefore not provide a level playing field and equal treatment to CD members to enable any useful and result-oriented discussions.

3. The working paper is not comprehensive. It does not propose any work under item 2 - prevention of nuclear war on the CD’s agenda. This agenda item is equally important. As proposed to you in your meeting with the G21 last Wednesday, we once again suggest that the CD should undertake substantive work on measures to reduce the risks of unintentional and accidental use of nuclear weapons, including through de-alerting and de-targeting of nuclear weapons. We also urge you to explore the possibilities on how to address the two issue which Pakistan proposed during the debate on the CD’s agenda in the CD’s programme of work.

4. The working paper mixes the issues of the programme of work and its implementation.
The CD’s first and foremost priority should be to seek consensus on a comprehensive and balanced programme of work. The issues relating to implementation of the programme of work, including decisions on appointment of chairs and special coordinators and their rotation should be handled separately but expeditiously after full consultations with CD members.

Mr. President, we have shared our position on the issue of Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty in a frank, candied and honest manner on 18th of February. Some CD members have appreciated our stance and expressed their understanding. The future FMCT, as being envisaged by some nuclear weapons states will be inherently flawed and contrary to the objectives of nuclear disarmament. The nuclear cooperation agreement signed by the nuclear weapons states has rendered the FMCT ineffective even before the commencement of its negotiations. The CD must address this fundamental question before embarking on the negotiating track. The CD cannot and should not be high jacked by the FMCT issue. The CD cannot be held as a hostage to the FMCT issue. There are other important issues on the CD’s agenda which must be addressed in order to strengthen international peace and stability. The issue of nuclear disarmament, Negative Security Assurances and Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space which have to be taken up for negotiating legally binding treaties.

Mr. President, in conclusion I would like to say that we encourage you and your successor to continue consultations with the view of reaching a consensus on the CD’s programme of work. These consultations would be meaningful if the ideas presented by the CD members are taken onboard for building consensus. Thank you Mr. President