

As we approach the end of this year's Session, I would like to make a brief comment on the work of the Conference on Disarmament which, I hope, has some relevance to the consideration on the high level meeting of 24 September.

A number of colleagues have repeatedly, along the current year as well as in previous Sessions, voiced complaints about the inactivity - or other depreciatory words - of the CD. The argument can be summarized by the fact that the Conference did not undertake this year, as in the previous ten years or so, neither any negotiation on disarmament nor adopted a program of work, that, according to the Rules of Procedure, should be the basis for starting a negotiation.

Blame is bestowed on the institution itself or in the rules that govern it. We even hear comments about Geneva not being a propitious location. Of course it is especially comfortable to be able to attribute the responsibility to one member State. All this, if I may use an expression common in my country are nothing more than "crocodile tears".

At this point in time it is necessary to say that I could not discern throughout the Session a clear political will from the part of the nuclear weapon States. I am not sure that all groups have the same desire to change the situation.

Having assured one of the six presidencies of 2010, having consulted one by one all delegations and having met all regional groups, I can have a clear picture.

Notwithstanding the absence of negotiations and the impossibility to adopt a program of work, I think the CD functioned as a political body. The simple fact that, since the beginning of the year, we negotiated on different possibilities for a program of work is in itself an evidence of the political significance of the CD. That comes from the political preeminence of the matter itself. The refusal to accept a program of work, the avoidance of real negotiations on nuclear disarmament are political attitudes. The same can be said of the opposite actions to find a way forward.

All institutions can be reformed and many delegations are ready to go back to a Special Session of the General Assembly in order to examine the matter. Others prefer to keep lamenting the status quo and the - so they say - the waste of time and money. Time is certainly relevant when we deal with highly political issues

albeit it may be of extended duration. As of money, I doubt States judge multilateral structures in terms of cash flow.

My delegation is prepared to continue the search for safer and more democratic international system in this high level institution.