



General Assembly

Sixty-seventh session

First Committee

21st meeting

Tuesday, 6 November 2012, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Percaya (Indonesia)

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Agenda items 86 to 102 (continued)

Action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chair: The last cluster we considered in informal paper 2 yesterday was cluster 6, entitled “Regional disarmament and security”. Consequently, we move on today to cluster 7, entitled “Disarmament machinery”, which is the last item in informal paper 2. Once we finish that, the Committee will take up the draft resolutions and decisions in informal paper 3/Rev.3, which has now been circulated.

I shall now give the floor to delegations that wish to make general statements other than in explanation of vote or position or to introduce draft resolutions or decisions under cluster 7.

I give the floor to the representative of Germany to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.33.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): On 25 October, I spoke as President of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) on the work of the CD in the framework of the panel on the disarmament machinery and, on 1 November, I asked that my statement introducing draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.33, on the report of the CD, which was circulated in the room and which was posted on the QuickFirst website, be included in the verbatim record. In both statements, I reflected on the experience I gained as the last of this annual session’s six CD Presidents and drew several conclusions. I can therefore be brief.

There is broad agreement that, after over a decade of inability to do the task it is mandated to do, the CD is in a difficult situation. Of course, Member States have different perceptions as to how critical the situation is and which factors are responsible for it. Therefore, they have different ideas as to how to remedy the situation. That is why it is not easy, to put it mildly, to find consensus, first on the report of the CD among CD member States and, secondly, on the draft resolution on the CD’s report among General Assembly member States, on which we will take action today.

Before we do so, however, it is important to stress that I have tried hard — and to the best of my ability — to listen to everybody and to accommodate concerns to the greatest possible extent. But, as I said consistently throughout the process, this is a case in which everyone cannot be made entirely happy because, given the mutually exclusive nature of some concerns and requests, there was an objective limit to what was indeed possible. That said, I do believe that everybody should be able to live with the outcome as contained in draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.33.

Putting aside all differences about what should be done in the present situation, I am still convinced that there continues to exist a widely held view among CD member States, CD observer States and indeed General Assembly member States, for that matter, that the best solution is still a Conference on Disarmament that, at long last, starts working properly, that is, that takes up negotiations on new instruments in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

12-57492 (E)



Please recycle

Therefore, allow me, in conclusion, and as outgoing CD President, to express my hope that a strong signal of collective political will will go out from this year's session of the General Assembly to capitals and Geneva alike, that indeed all efforts be undertaken to make the CD an effective body again.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Burundi to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.59.

Mr. Niyungeko (Burundi) (*spoke in French*): It is an honour to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa", as contained in document A/C.1/67/L.59, on behalf of 11 member States of the Committee, namely, Angola, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe and my own country, Burundi.

Established by the Secretary-General 20 years ago to promote arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament in the Central African region, the Committee has developed some measures that will build confidence and cooperation for security among member States. Under its impetus, the countries have established a non-aggression pact and a mutual assistance pact. In the same vein, a mechanism was set up to promote and consolidate peace and security in Central Africa, namely, the Peace and Security Council of Central Africa.

Upon the Committee's initiative, we have organized meetings on questions having to do with peace and security in Central Africa. Each one of those meetings was an opportunity for member States of the Committee to agree on relevant recommendations to strengthen trust for peace and security in the subregion. The Committee also adopted the Central African Convention for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons, their Ammunition, Parts and Components that can be used for their Manufacture, Repair or Assembly, also known as the Kinshasa Convention. A number of member States have already begun or completed their process of ratification of the Convention, which will enter into force soon.

The thirty-third and thirty-fourth ministerial meetings of the Standing Advisory Committee, held in Bangui from 5 to 9 December 2011, and in Bujumbura from 14 to 18 May 2012, respectively, confirms the

will, energy and vitality of the Committee. At the ministerial meeting held in Bangui, the members of the Committee adopted a statement as a road map to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons in Central Africa and to establish a system that should take shape under the presidency of Burundi with the assistance, in particular, of the United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa, the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Centre, the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate and the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force. Those concrete steps encourage us in the importance we give to the efforts of the Advisory Committee as mechanisms for building confidence, peace, security and stability in Central Africa.

That is why we are submitting the present draft resolution to the First Committee today. Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.59 mirrors the language of the resolution consensually adopted last year (resolution 66/55). The amendments, as members will have noted, are included as a way of incorporating in the draft resolution the actions undertaken by the Advisory Committee since the last session.

I would like, in particular, to draw First Committee members' attention to the three changes that we have made in the draft resolution.

Paragraphs 3 and 7 of resolution 66/55, on the Kinshasa Convention, have been replaced by a new paragraph 3, which reflects the most recent developments in the efforts by Member States to facilitate the entry into force of the Convention. Paragraphs 4, 5 and 8 of resolution 66/55, which reflect the developments of the past year, were replaced by a new paragraph 4, on the adoption of the Declaration on a road map for counter-terrorism and the non-proliferation of arms in Central Africa. Finally, paragraph 14 of the current draft resolution is almost identical to paragraph 17 of resolution 66/55. However, it does mention the efforts of the Standing Advisory Committee this year to respond to the threat to the subregion posed by the activities of the Lord's Resistance Army and the piracy and armed robbery in the Gulf of Guinea. However, we must highlight that this draft resolution, as indicated in its paragraph 1, has the primary goal of reaffirming the support of States Members of the United Nations for the efforts aimed at promoting confidence-building measures at the regional and subregional levels in order to help ease tensions and conflicts in Central Africa and to further sustainable peace, stability and development in the subregion.

I cannot conclude my statement without reiterating my thanks, on behalf of the States of the Central African subregion, to Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and to the Department of Political Affairs for the valuable ongoing assistance they provide to the Committee. I am particularly grateful to the Secretary-General for his important support for the role of the United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa since its establishment. In that regard, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the Regional Office, Mr. Abou Moussa, for his tireless efforts in carrying out his mandate.

I would also like to take this opportunity to welcome the ongoing commitment by the members of the Committee and to express my gratitude to the countries and institutions that contribute to the United Nations Trust Fund for the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa. It is thanks to that support that the Committee can look forward to pursuing its work for peace and security in Central Africa.

Finally, on behalf of the sponsors, I would like to once again thank the members of the Committee for their ongoing support to the draft resolution on the activities of the Committee. I urge them once again to reiterate that support by adopting draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.59 by consensus.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of the Netherlands to introduce draft decision A/C.1/67/L.31.

Mr. Van den IJssel (Netherlands): I speak on behalf of Switzerland, South Africa and, of course, my own country. Last year, the three of us introduced a draft of solution entitled “Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”. The First Committee adopted that draft resolution by consensus, and subsequently the General Assembly adopted it as resolution 66/66. The main aim of the resolution was to unite all United Nations Members on the need to revitalize the work of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) and take forward multilateral disarmament negotiations.

In the resolution, States were encouraged to build on the work that had already been undertaken and to explore, consider and consolidate options, proposals and elements for revitalizing the United Nations

disarmament machinery, including the CD. In the resolution, the Assembly also decided to include the item “Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations” on the agenda of the General Assembly at its sixty-seventh session, to review the progress made in the implementation of the resolution and, if necessary, to further explore options for taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations.

We note with concern that, despite the efforts by States and successive Presidents of the Conference on Disarmament in the 2012 session to reach consensus on a programme of work, the Conference did not succeed in commencing substantive work during its 2012 session. We welcome efforts to end that deadlock, which has for too long prevented the CD from fulfilling its task. We welcome the discussions consistent with paragraph 7 of resolution 66/66 on the revitalization of the Conference that took place in the CD during its 2012 session. We hope that the CD will take that process forward in 2013 to a more thorough and structured debate. We also note that a number of initiatives are being pursued this year in the First Committee that are directly or indirectly related to the work of the CD.

Having carefully considered all the various options, the authors of resolution 66/66 have decided not to submit a follow-up draft resolution at this year’s session, but to introduce a decision, contained in document A/C.1/67/L.31, which includes this item on the agenda of the General Assembly at its sixty-eighth session. We continue to see an urgent need to revitalize the work of the CD and United Nations disarmament machinery and will continue to advocate for progress towards that end. On that basis, we stand ready to revisit resolution 66/66 next year and to engage with delegations in assessing progress towards the implementation of the resolution and to take efforts forward. We hope that all delegations can support the decision contained in document A/C.1/67/L.31.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/67/L.31.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/67/L.31, entitled “Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”, was just introduced by the representative of the Netherlands.

The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/67/L.31.

The Chair: The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft decision without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/67/L.31 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.32.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.32, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific”, was submitted by the representative of Nepal on behalf of several sponsors at the Committee’s 18th meeting, on 2 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/67/L.32 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.4.

The Chair: The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.32 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.33.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.33, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”, was introduced, under sub-item (a) of agenda item 96, by the representative of Germany earlier in this meeting. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/67/L.33.

This draft resolution is accompanied by an oral statement by the Secretariat. With the Chair’s permission, I shall read it out now.

This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Under the terms of paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.33, the General Assembly would request

“The Secretary-General to continue to ensure and strengthen, if needed, the provision to the Conference on Disarmament of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services”.

It is recalled that resources for the substantive and Secretariat support of the Conference on Disarmament are included under section 4, “Disarmament”, and that the resources for conference services are included under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. Subject to decisions taken at the 2012 session of the Conference on Disarmament to establish its programme of work for 2013 and to establish any subsidiary bodies for its implementation, the strengthening of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services to the Conference, as requested in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, may entail additional resource requirements under the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. In that regard, the established procedure in the preparation of the statement of programme budget implications would be followed as necessary in the context of actions taken by the Conference on Disarmament. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.33 would not give rise to any programme budget implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 at this time.

The Chair: The sponsor has expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.33 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.38.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.38, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean”, was introduced, under sub-item (d) of agenda item 95, by the representative of Peru on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States at the Committee’s 17th meeting, on 1 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/67/L.38.

The Chair: The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.38 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.56.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.56, entitled “United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services”, was introduced, under sub-item (b) of agenda item 95, by the representative of Nigeria at the Committee’s 18th meeting, on 2 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/67/L.56 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.4.

The Chair: The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.56 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.57.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.57, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa”, was submitted, under sub-item (h) of agenda item 95, by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/67/L.57 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.4.

This draft resolution is accompanied by an oral statement by the Secretariat, which, with the Chair’s permission, I will read out now.

This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Under the terms of paragraphs 9 and 10 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.57, the General Assembly would request

“The Secretary-General to continue to facilitate close cooperation between the Regional Centre and the African Union, in particular in the areas of disarmament, peace and security”

and also request

“The Secretary-General to continue to provide the necessary support to the Regional Centre for greater achievements and results”.

The implementation of the request contained in paragraph 9 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. Regarding paragraph 10, the provision under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 covers one P-5 post, one P-3 post, two local-level posts and general operating expenses. The programme activities of the Regional Centre would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.57, no additional requirement would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

The Chair: The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.57 was adopted.

The Chair: I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to explain the status of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.59.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): We are still awaiting the budget document on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.59, which is prepared by a different department. It will take some time before we receive it, and therefore we cannot take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/59 until we receive that financial document.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who wishes to speak in explanation of position on the draft resolutions adopted under cluster 7.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.33, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

We have always supported the reactivation of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) based on a balanced and comprehensive programme of work and full observance of its rules of procedure. My delegation is of the view that the Conference on Disarmament should be responsive to the priorities and security concerns of all States.

We do not share the view that the decision in 2009 (CD/1864) reflected in the draft resolution was a balanced and comprehensive programme of work. However, we joined in the consensus in the CD that year for the sake of showing flexibility.

In our view, the existence of nuclear weapons is the greatest threat to the security of all nations. Accordingly, the CD should consider negotiations on nuclear disarmament as its highest priority.

My delegation also joined the consensus in adopting the draft resolutions on the United Nations Regional Centres in Latin America and Africa, as contained in documents A/C.1/67/L.38 and A/C.1/67/L.57, respectively, and will join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.59, on the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa, based on the understanding that all measures, references and concepts contained in such draft resolutions are applicable only to the countries in the regions concerned. My delegation, while dissociating itself from any reference in those draft resolutions to ammunition and explosives, armed violence and resolutions of the Security Council, including resolution 1325 (2000), would like to place on the record that those references should not set a precedent for their inclusion in the future in other draft resolutions of the First Committee or the scope of the issues or outcome documents of other disarmament forums, such as the meetings related to the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

The Chair: The Committee will now begin its consideration of the draft resolutions and decisions listed in informal paper 3/Rev.3, beginning with cluster I, entitled “Nuclear weapons”. Thereafter, we will take up the other clusters contained in that informal paper.

I shall now give the floor to give the floor to those delegations that wish to introduce draft resolutions or make general statements under cluster I.

I give the floor to the representative of Myanmar to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.50.

Mr. Wai (Myanmar): On behalf of the sponsors, it is my great pleasure to introduce the draft resolution entitled “Nuclear disarmament”, as contained in document A/C.1/67/L.50.

Nuclear weapons pose the greatest threat and danger to humankind. The risks of the use of nuclear weapons, their accidental triggering or their falling into the wrong hands lie mainly with existing stockpiles. In order to overcome those risks, we need to take step-by-step measures that lead to the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

The draft resolution calls upon the nuclear-weapon States to take practical steps to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified time frame. At the same time, pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, the draft resolution urges the nuclear-weapon States to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States through a legally binding instrument that they will not use or threaten to use their nuclear weapons. It is a legitimate right of the non-nuclear-weapon States that have voluntarily given up their nuclear option to demand that the nuclear-weapon States provide them with security assurances through a legally binding instrument.

This year’s draft resolution again calls for actions to meet again, in particular with the nuclear-weapon States, in order to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons. Such steps warrant immediate action. We would like to invite all Member States to work together to realize a nuclear-weapon-free world by supporting our draft resolution.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Austria to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46.

Mr. Kmentt (Austria): On behalf of its 20 sponsors, I take the floor to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”, as orally revised last week.

This draft resolution aims at facilitating substantive multilateral progress in the area of nuclear disarmament. It proposes that the General Assembly establish an open-ended working group in 2013, to convene for up to 15 working days, with the aim of developing proposals to take forward multilateral disarmament negotiations for the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons. The draft resolution is intended to provide an open and inclusive forum for States to express views on options to move the nuclear disarmament agenda forward without prejudice to any outcome.

The aim of the draft resolution is constructive; it is to help us all to move forward on this very important

issue. In the course of the current session, the sponsors have undertaken very broad and intensive consultations with all partners. We have listened very attentively and reflected carefully on the comments that have been made, and we have made an effort to incorporate the comments that we have received into the orally revised draft. We will continue to listen to all delegations to ensure that the process continues to be inclusive and transparent, and we are very grateful for the broad support that we have received on this initiative. We are extremely grateful for the constructive attitude of all of the partners with whom we have spoken, and we look forward to working in the future with interested delegations to ensure that this is a successful process.

I would like to once again thank all delegations and ask for as much support for this initiative as possible.

The Chair: Before proceeding to take action on the draft resolutions under cluster 1, I give the floor to the representative of Egypt, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46.

Mr. Aljowaily (Egypt): I would like to make a statement in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, which was introduced under cluster 1, entitled “Nuclear weapons”.

Egypt has always championed the cause of global nuclear disarmament. It has consistently presented proposals on how to achieve that objective, individually as well as through the groups that it has the honour to belong to, foremost among which are the Non-Aligned Movement and the New Agenda Coalition. Unfortunately, little has materialized on furthering the cause of nuclear disarmament, and we still live in the shadow of those heinous weapons. We therefore support genuine multilateral efforts aimed at achieving global nuclear disarmament.

Egypt considers the Conference on Disarmament (CD) to be the only multilateral negotiating body on disarmament issues. We believe that attempts to make progress on the programme of work and the issues before it should be geared towards making the Conference on Disarmament work. Egypt believes that the lack of political will is the obstacle preventing the CD from adopting a comprehensive and balanced programme of work that would address equally the four core issues under its responsibility, especially nuclear disarmament.

Egypt has decided to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, as orally revised, as the new text of the draft resolution reaffirms the role and functions of the Conference on Disarmament and of the Disarmament Commission, as set out in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, that is, the first special session devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2).

Egypt has engaged actively in the consultation process with regard to this draft resolution, in the light of the fact that paragraph 1 of the present draft resolution suggests that the objective of the working group to be established is the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons. Egypt has therefore decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a reflection of its strong commitment to the goal of nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons, while hereby restating nonetheless its principled position on the multilateral disarmament machinery.

Separately, we believe that if the entirety of the disarmament machinery needs to be reviewed, we should not single out one single part of the machinery as such and try to circumvent it accordingly. We hold that the proper venue to review the disarmament machinery is at a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Egypt will therefore continue to seek within the CD the early adoption of a comprehensive and balanced programme of work that allows for the resumption of substantive work while dealing with all core issues on the agenda of the Conference, with clear priority being given to achieving nuclear disarmament.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.40, entitled “Mongolia’s international security and nuclear-weapon-free status”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.40, entitled “Mongolia’s international security and nuclear-weapon-free status”, was introduced, under sub-item (k) of agenda item 94, by the representative of Mongolia at the Committee’s 11th and 19th meetings, on 19 October and 5 November, respectively. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/67/L.40.

On 5 November, the delegation of Mongolia introduced and circulated a revision to paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.40. Accordingly, that paragraph should read as follows:

“Welcomes the declaration of 17 September 2012 by Mongolia and the five nuclear-weapon States on Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free status as a concrete contribution to the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the enhancement of confidence and predictability in the region”.

The Chair: The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.40, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.45.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.45, entitled “Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas”, was submitted by the representatives of New Zealand and Brazil. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/67/L.45 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.4.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya,

Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

France, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of)

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.45 was adopted by 165 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Georgia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, entitled “Taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”, was introduced, under agenda item 94, by the representative of Mexico at the Committee’s 17th meeting, on 1 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.46 and CRP.3/Rev.4.

While introducing draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, the delegation of Mexico made an oral revision. Accordingly, the third preambular paragraph reads as follows:

“Reaffirming the role and functions of the Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission, as set out in the final document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament”.

Paragraph 2 should read as follows:

“Also decides that the working group will convene in Geneva in 2013 for up to 15 working days, within available time frames, with the contribution of international organizations and civil society, in accordance with established practice, and will hold its organizational session as soon as possible”.

Lastly, paragraph 4 should read as follows:

“Requests the Secretary-General to provide, within available resources, the support necessary to convene the aforementioned working group and also to transmit the report of the working group to the Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission”.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46 is accompanied by an oral statement by the Secretariat, which, with the Chair’s permission, I will read out now.

This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, as orally revised, the General Assembly would, respectively, decide “to establish an open-ended working group to develop proposals to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations for the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons”; “that the working group will convene in Geneva in 2013 for up to 15 working days, within available timeframes, with the contribution of international organizations and civil society, in accordance with established practice, and will hold its organizational session as soon as possible”; and that the working group shall submit a report on its work, reflecting discussions held and all proposals made, to the General Assembly at its sixty-eighth session, which will assess its work, taking into account developments in other relevant forums. The General Assembly would also request the Secretary-General “to provide, within available resources, the support necessary to convene

the aforementioned working group and to transmit the report of the working group to the Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission”.

It is understood that the up to 15 working days during which the working group would convene would fall under the 24-week-long session of the Conference on Disarmament. It is, however, also understood that any such meetings of the working group would not be convened in parallel with the meetings of the Conference on Disarmament and that its substantive and Secretariat servicing would subsequently be contingent upon the availability of time frames unused by the Conference. It is recalled that resources for the substantive and Secretariat support of the Conference on Disarmament are included under section 4, “Disarmament”, and that the resources for the conference services are included under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, as orally revised, would not give rise to any programme budget implications under the proposed budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint

Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

France, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Algeria, Andorra, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cambodia, China, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, India, Israel, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, as orally revised, was adopted by 134 votes to 4, with 34 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Portugal informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegations of Ethiopia and Georgia informed the Secretariat that they had intended to abstain.]

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on A/C.1/67/L.50, entitled "Nuclear disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.50, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", was introduced, under sub-item (ee) of agenda item 94, by the representative of Myanmar earlier during this meeting. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.50 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.4.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate recorded vote has also been requested on operative paragraph 16. We shall first take action on operative paragraph 16.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Pakistan

Abstaining:

Armenia, Belarus, France, Israel, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uzbekistan

Operative paragraph 16 was retained by 165 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Albania and Belarus informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.50, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey,

Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Austria, Belarus, India, Ireland, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Montenegro, New Zealand, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Serbia, South Africa, Sweden, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.50, as a whole, was adopted by 111 votes to 43, with 20 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to delegations that wish to explain their positions or votes on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Pollard (United Kingdom): I speak on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States with regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/67/L.45 and A/C.1/67/46.

With respect to A/C.1/67/L.45, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", we would like to emphasize the importance that we attach to the development, where appropriate, of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones. They can be an important contribution to regional and global security, provided that they are, first, established as set out in the 1999 Disarmament Commission guidelines, that is, that they are supported by all States of the region concerned and by the nuclear-weapon States; secondly, the subject of appropriate treaties, including comprehensive safeguards provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency; and, thirdly, satisfactorily concluded in consultation with the nuclear-weapon States.

We still believe that it is contradictory to propose simultaneously the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone that would be composed largely of the high seas and yet to say that it would be fully consistent with the applicable principles and the rules of international law relating to the freedom of the high seas and the right of passage through maritime space, including those of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. We continue to question whether the real goal of this draft resolution is in fact the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone covering the high seas. We do not believe that this ambiguity has been sufficiently clarified. In addition, the sponsors have introduced several changes to the text that, in the view of our Governments, take us further

away from our ability to support this draft resolution. For those reasons, we voted against draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.45.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/67/46, entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”, France, the United Kingdom and the United States see little value in this initiative to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations outside of the established forums. Despite recalling the role of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and that of the disarmament architecture, it seeks to circumvent those mechanisms established for dealing with these issues — Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament — rather than tackling the problems that those institutions are currently facing and dealing with the causes of their impasse.

It is also unclear how this fits into the existing framework of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) or furthers the goals of the NPT action plan, which was agreed by consensus in 2010. In our view, this road map of 64 actions offers the best way of taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations along with the related issues. Organizing a new process to discuss again the same issue may jeopardize the consensus we were able to achieve in 2010 and the momentum for the 2015 Review Conference. In addition, this new process is solely focused on nuclear disarmament, whereas the NPT covers all three pillars in a balanced manner.

We continue to have grave concerns as to the preparatory aspects of this meeting, its rules of procedure and other working methods. In addition, given the stringent financial climate we are currently experiencing, we are also concerned about any additional budgetary impact this activity may have.

It is for those reasons that we are unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, the establishment of the open-ended working group and any outcome it may produce.

Ms. Poroli (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to explain my delegation’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”.

Argentina supports all initiatives that promote the discussion of ideas and proposals that afford a greater dynamism to the structure of the Conference on Disarmament, and the disarmament machinery in

general, in order to move past the current impasse. However, my delegation believes that it is not advisable to promote negotiation processes outside of the Conference on Disarmament, as that would negatively affect the balance and integrity of the current disarmament structure.

Argentina believes that it is important to participate in all groups, bodies or forums established to reflect upon alternatives aimed at bringing greater dynamism to the work of the Conference on Disarmament and the disarmament machinery in such a way that progress would be achieved in substantive negotiations within the context of the Conference on Disarmament and the United Nations. In that regard, my delegation’s vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46 should be interpreted as a sign of the constructive spirit and responsibility of a State that is committed to disarmament and defending peace and international security.

Mr. Li Yang (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to take this opportunity to briefly explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, entitled “Taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”.

China has always supported the total elimination of, and a complete ban on, nuclear weapons. We support the objective and spirit of this draft resolution.

At the same time, China is of the view that the establishment of an open-ended working group to develop proposals to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations is not viable. The Conference on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission and multilateral disarmament mechanisms are faced with difficulties of a mainly political, rather than technical, nature. The establishment of an open-ended working group may diminish or weaken the status and role of the existing multilateral disarmament mechanisms. Moreover, it would be difficult to preserve the principle of consensus and the participation of major countries.

Furthermore, the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons has already formulated a specific action plan on nuclear disarmament. The establishment of an open-ended working group would not be conducive to the implementation of that plan.

In view of those considerations, China cannot support the establishment of the open-ended working

group. We therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): We have three explanations of vote to make.

First, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.45, entitled “Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas”, Pakistan has always supported the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, in accordance with the arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the regions concerned. We ourselves sought to promote that objective in our region for 24 years, until the nuclearization of South Asia in 1998. We appreciate the efforts of the sponsors in revising the contents of the draft resolution to reflect the reality on the ground in South Asia. Accordingly, we voted in favour of the draft resolution for the first time.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.50, entitled “Nuclear disarmament”, Pakistan’s support for the goals of nuclear disarmament, as well as the total elimination of nuclear weapons, has been clear and consistent. We share several of the positions contained in the draft resolution, including, inter alia, the call for the establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament; the conclusion of a legally binding instrument on negative security assurances; and the need to take into account the security interests of all States while negotiating disarmament treaties.

However, we note that the draft resolution contains unnecessary references to the full implementation of the action plan of the last Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In line with our well-known position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Paragraph 16 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.50 calls for the immediate commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT). It is indeed ironic that a draft resolution on nuclear disarmament chooses to reflect only the non-proliferation-centric aspect of FMCT negotiations. That anomaly notwithstanding, Pakistan, in line with its clear and unambiguous position on an FMCT, decided to vote against this paragraph.

Turning to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, entitled “Taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”, Pakistan supports the goal of nuclear

disarmament and a world without nuclear weapons. We concur with several elements of the draft resolution, particularly the frustration over the lack of progress on nuclear disarmament negotiations. However, we are concerned that the proposal to establish an open-ended working group would weaken the United Nations disarmament machinery, especially the sole disarmament negotiating forum, that is, the Conference on Disarmament.

As we have maintained for many years, the international consensus underpinning the disarmament and non-proliferation regime has eroded. We recognize the continuing differences in approaches, perspectives and modalities to overcome the challenges. In our view, the best way forward is to restore the old consensus while seeking to harmonize and reconcile those differences. We believe that a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament provides the best platform to deal with the entire range of issues — not just the agenda or objectives, but also the disarmament machinery as well.

Mr. Amano (Japan): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain Japan’s position on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”, on which Japan voted in favour.

Japan believes that all States need to take further practical and effective nuclear disarmament measures in order to bring about a peaceful and secure world free of nuclear weapons. In that regard, we consider achieving a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices as the next step for the international community to take. We therefore expect that the discussions by the open-ended working group to be established by this draft resolution will contribute to the commencement of negotiations on such a treaty. In order to ensure that those negotiations are effective, Japan considers it essential for the major stakeholders, including the nuclear-weapon States, to participate in them.

My delegation would also like to explain Japan’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.50, entitled “Nuclear disarmament”, on which Japan abstained in the voting. Japan shares the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, which is the focus of the draft resolution. However, in order to steadily implement concrete measures for nuclear disarmament, we attach the greatest importance to united actions by the

international community, including the nuclear-weapon States. In that regard, there remains a gap between my country's view and the approach of the draft resolution.

Mr. El Oumni (Morocco): First of all, we would like to thank the authors of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, entitled "Taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations", for their constructive and inclusive approach.

Morocco voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, as it remains open to all discussions to explore the means of advancing the objective of nuclear disarmament through multilateral negotiations. Morocco's support for nuclear disarmament has been consistently firm.

We support the draft resolution on the understanding that, first, the mandate of the open-ended working group is to develop proposals and to report on its work while taking into account the discussions and all proposals made. Its role is not to carry out an overall review of the disarmament machinery. Secondly, the Conference on Disarmament should remain the sole negotiating forum of the United Nations disarmament machinery. Ideas on how to enhance its work should respect its mandate, role and authority. Thirdly, the best way forward in nuclear disarmament is to implement the existing obligations and commitments, in particular in the framework of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Mr. Ermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Our delegation would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations".

The Russian Federation voted against the text for reasons that are simple and well known. Russia does not see the practical sense of establishing an open-ended working group to discuss issues that are all being considered multilaterally by the international community in different forums, including within the thematic discussions of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. The stagnation in the disarmament process is not due to imperfect structures; it is well known to all that it is because of the political factors involved. The emergence, under United Nations auspices, of a new guiding forum with various goals and an unclear mandate is not a solution to the existing problems, but creates only the appearance of moving forward.

In our view, the lack of a clearly worded mandate for the work of such a working group could lead to results

completely contrary to the objectives of the sponsors. Compounded by the destabilizing effect of the existing international disarmament machinery, it could result in destroying the consensual basis of decision-making on important disarmament issues and in key States no longer participating in the disarmament negotiations.

That is an unacceptable prospect for us. The Russian ideas were set out in the joint statement by interested States made last week in the Committee (see A/C.1/67/PV.18). We are grateful to our partners for the support that they have already voiced and for their sponsorship. The joint statement by interested States in support of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva is open to all those that wish to associate with it. We call on all interested countries to join the statement, not out of propaganda but in order to move forward with realistic action that truly helps to revive the multilateral disarmament work on the basis of consensus, taking into consideration the security of all States, without exception.

Mr. Kucer (Slovakia): I take the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations". My country is fully committed to creating a safer world for us all. Disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, is an important tool that, we believe, can bring us closer to that goal.

Slovakia traditionally places the principle of multilateralism at the centre of the efforts of the international community for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. We believe that we can achieve our commonly shared and desired goal of a world free of nuclear weapons through a comprehensive framework of guaranteed measures and instruments.

My country continues to see the Conference on Disarmament (CD) as the sole multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament matters. We are convinced that the CD is still the best place to produce global, well-founded and viable instruments. The CD concept offers a potential to find negotiated solutions. The history of the negotiations in the CD has shown that that forum has the potential to deliver. We need to resuscitate that body and to implement the mandate given to it by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1978, thus reviving its potential.

We understand that existing mechanisms are well established to address the pressing issue of nuclear disarmament if there is sufficient political will. We do

not need to create a new mechanism. With sufficient political will, we can still find consensus and reach an outcome that is acceptable to all. We must redouble our efforts and focus on that option.

Nevertheless, we voted in favour of the draft resolution, on the understanding that the initiative is aimed at providing additional impetus that would enable the existing disarmament machinery to start negotiations.

Mr. Magalhães (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”, because we share many States’ deep frustration at the absence of concrete outcomes in the multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations within the United Nations framework. As the Secretary-General has said, “The world is overarmed and peace is underfunded”. The time has come to reaffirm commitments to nuclear disarmament. The international community must devise ways and means to effectively achieve, within a clear timetable, the objective of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

The draft resolution establishes an open-ended working group to develop proposals to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations. Brazil voted in favour of that initiative, on the understanding that it can be a useful step towards a comprehensive and effective negotiation process in the Conference on Disarmament (CD). As such, we see the working group as a path that converges with the CD, which is the sole multilateral body for negotiations on disarmament.

We should be under no illusion that the difficulties faced by the CD will be overcome in other forums. The reasons for the stalemate in that body are clearly political and not related to institutional or procedural issues. The main motivation guiding us should be the recognition of the imperative to eliminate, as a matter of urgency, the immense nuclear arsenals that, in addition to threatening all humankind, aggravate tensions and hamper efforts towards peace.

The result of our efforts should be the negotiation of a larger legal framework — that of a nuclear-weapons convention that will finally ensure the long overdue implementation of article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Finally, allow me to state that, in Brazil’s view, the most appropriate path to consider the issue of taking forward multilateral nuclear negotiations would be by means of the convening of a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The session would debate all related aspects, including substantive organizational and procedural issues.

Mr. Proaño (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): Ecuador voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”, owing to our clear and consistent stance in favour of and commitment to nuclear disarmament. At the same time, my delegation wishes to reiterate its position on the United Nations disarmament machinery. In that context, we believe that this topic should be considered at a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In that regard, Ecuador wishes once again to affirm that the Conference on Disarmament is the single multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament in the United Nations, as acknowledged in draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46. That is why the pursuit of any negotiations outside of the Conference would be tantamount to undermining it and the entire United Nations disarmament machinery.

Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”, our delegation wishes to make the following explanation of vote.

Cuba voted in favour of the draft resolution because nuclear disarmament is the highest priority in the field of disarmament. That is a stance that we defend both in our national capacity and as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement. Cuba ascribes great importance to the need to bring about concrete progress in negotiations and deliberations in the field of disarmament and, in particular, to achieve the total elimination and prohibition of nuclear weapons.

Our country shares the concern around the world at the threat posed to international peace and security and to the preservation of the human race by the existence of more than 20,000 nuclear weapons, 5,000 of which are ready to be used immediately. Cuba has, at the highest level and repeatedly, underscored the need to totally eliminate nuclear weapons. We have supported the holding of a high-level international conference to reach agreement on a programme for the total elimination of such weapons.

At the same time, we believe that we should abandon once and for all the concept of nuclear deterrence as the basis of unsustainable and unacceptable military doctrines that, far from contributing to nuclear disarmament, perpetuate the possession of such weapons.

Our country would welcome the opening of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament (CD) on a treaty that would eliminate and prohibit nuclear weapons. The Conference on Disarmament should adopt, as soon as possible, a broad and balanced programme of work that takes into account current priorities in the disarmament arena, addressing the priority ascribed to nuclear disarmament at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. That topic should be given priority in the programme of work of the CD.

The Conference on Disarmament has been unable to carry out substantive work for more than a decade because certain nuclear Powers are opposed to negotiating a convention that fully prohibits nuclear weapons, or other treaties on priority matters for the majority of the members of the Conference.

Cuba remains committed to the Conference on Disarmament and to the decision of the Assembly affirming that the Conference on Disarmament is the single multilateral forum for negotiating treaties in the area of disarmament. We wish to reiterate our concern at the ideas of some that would remove the main topics from the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament or set the Conference aside to move to alternative processes for negotiating disarmament treaties in other venues. That would be a dangerous step backwards. We reiterate that it continues to be the responsibility of all to preserve and strengthen the CD.

With regard to the establishment of an open-ended working group of the General Assembly, as called for in draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, to develop proposals to take forward multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament, we hope that that will not undermine the role and mandate of the Conference on Disarmament. In its work, we hope that such a group would take into due account proposals from delegations and would operate in line with established practices. We would have preferred to see greater clarity in the text regarding the procedures and mandate that will govern the work of the group, as we had put forth in the informal consultations on the draft resolution. Cuba believes that such group

should, as a mechanism of the General Assembly, operate under its rules of procedure, with the ultimate goal of achieving legally binding measures to eliminate and prohibit nuclear weapons. We propose that the organizational session of such a working group be held at Headquarters in New York, where all countries have representation.

Let me conclude by reiterating Cuba's support for efforts to optimize the United Nations disarmament machinery. However, we are certain that the paralysis affecting much of that machinery results primarily from a lack of political will on the part of a number of States when it comes to making genuine progress, in particular in the area of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Gill (India): I take the floor in explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/67/L.46 and A/C.1/67/L.50.

My delegation's views on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.40 were stated yesterday and, in the interest of time, I will not repeat them today. We hope they will be reflected appropriately in the record.

My delegation attaches the highest priority to nuclear disarmament. We share with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46 the objective of taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations, and we appreciate their open and inclusive approach in piloting that text. However, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46 for the following reasons, even though we understand and share the aspirations behind the text.

The Conference on Disarmament (CD) is the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum and continues to have the mandate, membership, credibility and rules of procedure to discharge that responsibility. Nuclear disarmament continues to be on the agenda of the CD as a multilateral negotiating forum. We believe that an open-ended working group established outside of the CD under the General Assembly's rules of procedure may not lead to productive outcomes in taking forward the multilateral nuclear disarmament agenda with the participation of all relevant countries. We remain to be convinced that the form and manner in which the sponsors propose to take forward such negotiations could credibly advance our common objectives or would not have an adverse impact on the resources available to the established disarmament forums.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/L.50, entitled “Nuclear disarmament”, India attaches the highest priority to nuclear disarmament. India shares the main objective of that draft resolution, which is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified framework of time.

We have been constrained to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution because of certain references to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, on which India’s position is well known. However, our vote should not be seen as opposition to other provisions of the draft resolution, which we believe are consistent with that of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) as well as India’s national positions on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Those provisions include the reference to the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, NAM summit statements, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (see A/51/218), the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, the role and work of the CD, including the establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament in the Conference as the highest priority, the negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty in the CD on the basis of the Shannon mandate, as well as the call for convening an international conference on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects at an early date to identify and deal with concrete measures for nuclear disarmament. We compliment Myanmar for retaining vital principled positions in this draft resolution, which is supported by the vast majority of countries.

Mr. Kang Myong Chol (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea): The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.50, entitled “Nuclear disarmament”, because the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea associates itself with the Non-Aligned Movement’s principled position that recognizes nuclear disarmament as the top priority and the most fundamental issue related to world peace and security.

Nuclear disarmament is the only ultimate solution to the issue of non-proliferation because non-proliferation itself stems from the threat of the use of nuclear weapons by nuclear-weapon States.

The five permanent members of the Security Council should take the lead on the nuclear disarmament path with all sincerity. They should drastically reduce their nuclear arsenals with a view to the total elimination of

nuclear weapons, commit themselves to unconditional negative security assurances and withdraw all nuclear weapons deployed outside their territories.

The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea is ready to join the international nuclear disarmament efforts on an equal footing with other nuclear-weapon States. It will not compete in a nuclear arms race nor produce nuclear weapons beyond its need for self-defence.

There are some elements in the text of the draft resolution, however, that we find uncomfortable, namely, those regarding the implementation of the action plan of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the call for adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. But we nonetheless voted in favour of the draft resolution, because we subscribe to its core objectives.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the vote of my delegation with regard to the draft resolution entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”, as contained in document A/C.1/67/L.46, as orally amended.

We voted in favour of this draft resolution since it deals with nuclear disarmament, which is the highest priority of the international community in the field of disarmament. At the same time, we would like to put on record that, based on our interpretation of the draft resolution, the open-ended working group established by this draft resolution has no negotiating mandate and does not substitute for any part of the multilateral disarmament machinery, and its role and mandate shall not, in any way, be in contradiction with the role, mandate and authority of a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): Allow me to explain our vote on the draft resolution entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”, as contained in document A/C.1/67/L.46.

My country attaches the highest priority to nuclear disarmament. The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2) of 1978 defined the priorities of the international community in working seriously towards nuclear disarmament and put those priorities on a specific agenda, to be dealt with in the Conference on Disarmament.

However, the lack of political will on the part of some Powers has posed obstacles to international efforts in this area and impeded the Conference from implementing its mandate as a result of the provocative application of double standards and acceptance of certain mechanisms for international consensus.

The Conference on Disarmament is the sole negotiating forum for issues of disarmament, and it is important to respect the rules of procedure of the Conference, which constitute an essential and fundamental basis necessary to the success of any work that could be agreed on. We stress that the Conference must adopt a balanced and comprehensive programme of work that should, by necessity, include subsidiary organs for negotiation on the total elimination of nuclear weapons in accordance with a time frame that is unconditional and defined. We need an unconditional, legally binding international instrument that provides negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States — that is, assurances of their non-use or threat of use against such States — as well as negotiations on avoiding an arms race in outer space and on the prohibition of the production of fissile materials.

My country believes that disarmament mechanisms should only be discussed at a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and that any recommendations regarding negotiations on nuclear disarmament and other relevant issues must be referred to the organs of the disarmament machinery. Negotiations on nuclear disarmament should take place within the Conference on Disarmament.

For those reasons, my delegation has abstained in the voting on the resolution entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”.

Mr. Moktefi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Allow me to explain Algeria’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46, entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”.

While we recognize the efforts to improve the content of the text and the concern of the authors of the draft resolution with regard to nuclear disarmament, the approach taken remains fundamentally problematic. In addition to the question of any value added by the working group, creating a new body is in fact an initiative that is risky in several ways. To engage in a new process is, despite the precautionary language, a flagrant threat to the role and mandate of the Disarmament Commission and Conference on Disarmament, which are the

only bodies mandated to deliberate and negotiate on questions of nuclear disarmament.

The approach taken in this draft resolution also undertakes a new dynamic, the outcome of which is doubtful. Algeria therefore believes that the only way to reaffirm the role and the function of the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament is to abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. Gillon (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): Belgium voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46. Belgium’s support for the draft resolution should not be interpreted as an attempt to diminish the Conference on Disarmament, to which Belgium belongs, or as an indication that a new disarmament forum can be envisaged without clear commitments negotiated in good faith in the Conference on Disarmament. Our position is that the Conference on Disarmament must begin implementing a balanced and substantive programme of work.

Belgium’s clear priority is the launching of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty. We call on all States to take a constructive approach in that regard. We must all assume our responsibility to reach that attainable goal and thereby send a signal by taking an essential and concrete step towards the ultimate goal of a world free of weapons of mass destruction.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to delegations that wish to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions or decisions under cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”.

I give the floor to the representative of Argentina to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.36.

Ms. Poroli (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): On behalf of its sponsors, I would like to introduce for the Committee’s consideration draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.36, entitled “Information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms”.

I would also like to incorporate the following oral amendments into the text, which have been published on the QuickFirst website.

(*spoke in English*)

Paragraph 5 should read as follows:

“Notes with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General submitted pursuant to resolution

65/63, entitled “Information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms”.

Paragraph 6 should read as follows:

“Takes note of the conclusions of the report, including, inter alia, the importance of tailoring confidence-building measures agreed in regional and subregional or bilateral contexts to the particular security concerns of States within a region and subregion”.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.36.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.36, entitled “Information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms”, was just introduced by the representative of Argentina. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.36 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.4.

The representative of Argentina has just made oral revisions to the draft resolution by which changes were made to operative paragraphs 5 and 6.

The Chair: The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution, as orally revised, without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.36, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to delegations that wish to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions or decisions under cluster 5, “Other disarmament measures and international security”.

Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Under cluster 5, our delegation would like to make a general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.30, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”. This draft resolution addresses issues of great importance, which is why we once again sponsored it this year.

The hostile use of telecommunications, whether overtly or secretly, to undermine the legal and political order in a State constitutes a violation of the internationally recognized norms in this area, which could lead to tensions and situations that are harmful

to international peace and security, thereby also undermining the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Cuba fully shares the concern expressed in the draft resolution with regard to the use of information technology to ends incompatible with international stability and security that have a negative effect on all States and damage both civilian and military security.

The draft resolution also places appropriate emphasis to the need to prevent the use of information resources and technology for criminal or terrorist purposes. In that context, my delegation is compelled once again to denounce the aggression that has been perpetrated by the Government of the United States against Cuba via radio and television for several decades, in violation of the principles of international law and the relevant international norms regulating the electromagnetic spectrum. That aggression is being carried out without regard to the damage it could cause to international peace and security, thereby bringing about dangerous situations, including through the use of military aircraft to transmit television signals to our country with the consent of the Republic of Cuba.

In 2011, an average of 2,193 hours of illegal weekly transmissions were broadcast on 30 different frequencies from United States territory into Cuba. As has been noted in previous statements, some of those broadcasters belong to or lend their services to organizations that are linked to known terrorist groups that reside in the United States and act against Cuba from there, transmitting programmes that incite sabotage, political attacks and the assassination of officials and engaging in other types of radio terrorism.

The World Radiocommunication Conference in Geneva has repeatedly denounced the illegal nature of those broadcasts against Cuba and has characterized them as contrary to the rules of radio broadcasting. Our country will continue to adopt all measures within its grasp to try to put an end to those unacceptable and illegal aggressive actions, and we will continue to denounce the aggression at every possible international forum. We hope that, as in the past, draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.30 will enjoy support from the vast majority of delegations.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Trinidad and Tobago to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.35/Rev.1.

Mr. Charles (Trinidad and Tobago): You will recall, Mr. Chair, that we introduced draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.35 last week. We also indicated that, since the submission of the draft resolution to the Secretariat, a number of informal consultations had been held. As a matter of fact, three or four consultations and a series of bilateral consultations took place, which produced the revision of the draft resolution. Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.35/Rev.1, which we hope will be adopted by consensus this morning, attempts to heighten the participation of women in disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control since the resolution was first introduced in 2010.

We have noticed an important omission in paragraph 1 of the text that is before the Committee this morning that is not consistent with what we had submitted to the Secretariat. The word “relevant” should be inserted before the word “regional” in paragraph 1. That paragraph should therefore read as follows:

“Urges Member States, relevant regional and subregional organizations, the United Nations and specialized agencies to promote equal opportunities for the representation of women in all decision-making processes with regard to matters related to disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control, in particular as it relates to the prevention and reduction of armed violence and armed conflict”.

We hope that that will not cause any inconvenience to delegations. Again, it is our hope, together with the hope of the other sponsors, that this particular draft resolution on women’s participation in this specific area would be adopted by consensus.

Mr. Lindell (Sweden): Under cluster 5, I have the honour to make this general statement with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.30, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”. I make this statement on behalf of Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Uruguay and my own country, Sweden.

We join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.30. However, owing to recent developments

in this field, we would like to stress some particularly relevant aspects.

One of the starting points for our delegations regarding the key features of the Internet is that it should remain open, thereby facilitating the free flow of information in cyberspace. For us, one principle is very basic: the same universal human rights that individuals enjoy offline, such as freedom of expression, including the freedom to seek and impart information, and the freedom of assembly and association, must also be upheld and protected online. We therefore welcome the resolution adopted at the twentieth session of the Human Rights Council, earlier this year, that affirms that the same rights that people have offline must also be applied and protected online (Human Rights Council resolution 20/8). We note that the resolution was adopted by consensus in the Human Rights Council, giving it universal backing. We furthermore welcome the United Nations Human Rights Committee’s general comment No. 34, which also confirms the application of freedom of expression on the Internet (CCPR/C/GC/34).

An open and free Internet is a key requirement for economic, social and political development in the twenty-first century. The fact that the development of the Internet has not been exclusively left in the hands of Governments has been key to its success. That is why another fundamental position for our delegations is that discussions with wider implications for the future of the Internet should be based on a multistakeholder approach, including not least private-sector and civil society actors.

We should also recognize that an increasingly digitized society leads to increased vulnerability for individuals, businesses and States alike. Security in an increasingly interconnected world will, to a great extent, revolve around protecting “flows” of different kinds. Cyberattacks, cyberespionage and cybercrime are no longer tales of fiction, and those risks and vulnerabilities need to be addressed. That also implies challenges, as our traditional tools of addressing those risks have yet to adapt to the global and boundless nature of cyberspace. It is clear, however, that the work against threats to our freedom and security in cyberspace can be tackled only through global cooperation between States as well as the private sector and civil society. That important work needs to be intensified.

In addressing cyberchallenges, we must begin by engaging in an international discussion on norms and

principles of responsible State behaviour as well as on confidence-building and transparency measures. There is now broad recognition among many States that existing international law serves as the appropriate framework applicable to activity in cyberspace. Despite the particular character of the Internet, established international criteria and legal frameworks remain the same. Much work has been done over the past year in developing a better understanding of these issues, in particular the efforts of the ongoing Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security. The Group's 2010 consensus report (see A/65/201) included two important recommendations — further dialogue to discuss norms to reduce collective risk and protect critical national and international infrastructure, and the development of confidence-building measures to reduce the risk of misperception.

We engage in these discussions on the basis that existing international law is applicable and that our universal values of human rights, democracy and the rule of law guide our deliberations on norms in cyberspace.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.30.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.30, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”, was introduced under agenda item 89 by the representative of the Russian Federation at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 1 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.30 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.4. In addition, Cuba has also become a sponsor.

The Chair: The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.30 without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.30 was adopted.

The Chair: the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.35/Rev.1, as orally revised.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.35/Rev.1, entitled “Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control”, was introduced under sub-item (g) of agenda item 94 by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 1 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.35/Rev.1 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.4.

The Chair: The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.35/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.37.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.37, entitled “Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures”, was introduced under sub-item (i) of agenda item 94 by the representative of Germany at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 1 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.37 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.4.

With your permission, Mr. Chair, I will now read out an oral statement that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.37.

This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.37, the General Assembly would request

“The Secretary-General to provide the Office for Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat with resources adequate for maintaining the Programme of Action Implementation Support System, thus securing its important role in identifying and communicating information on needs and resources so as to enhance the implementation of the Programme of Action”.

It is envisaged that the existing extrabudgetary resources will be sufficient for maintaining the Programme of Action Implementation Support System through the biennium 2012-2013.

With regard to the request of the Secretary-General to provide the Office for Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat with resources adequate for maintaining the Programme of Action Implementation Support System, the attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section 4 of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the most recent of which is resolution 66/246, of 24 December 2011, in which the General Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibility for administrative and budgetary matters and affirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.37, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

The Chair: The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.37 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.42.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.42, entitled “United Nations Disarmament Information Programme”, was submitted by the representative of Mexico. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.42 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.4.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.42 was adopted.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, which wishes to speak in explanation of position following the adoption of the draft resolutions under cluster 5.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation joined the consensus in adopting draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.35/Rev.1, as orally revised, entitled “Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control”. However, we would like to place on

the record that we will implement the draft resolution inasmuch as it is in line with our Constitution, laws and regulations, as well as administrative procedures.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution under cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security”.

I give the floor to the representative of Algeria to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.6.

Mr. Moktefi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Under cluster 6, entitled “Regional disarmament and security”, my delegation has the pleasure and the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.6, entitled “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”.

With the exception of some technical updates, this draft resolution retains the text contained in the previous resolution on this item (resolution 66/63). In particular, it sums up the efforts deployed by Mediterranean countries to tackle in a global and coordinated manner the challenges that they all face. The general objective is to make the Mediterranean region a region of dialogue, exchange and cooperation, thereby ensuring peace, stability and prosperity. Finally, this text reaffirms that the security of the Mediterranean region is tied to the security of Europe as well as to international peace and security.

The Algerian delegation, along with the 50 other sponsors of the draft resolution, calls for the consensus adoption of this draft resolution, which is of even greater importance and relevance given the recent developments in the Mediterranean region.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who wishes to speak in explanation of position before we take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.6.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation will not participate in the Committee’s action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.6, entitled “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”.

Given the continued crisis in the occupied territories of Palestine and the imposition by the Zionist regime of the severest blockade, including from the Mediterranean part, on the people of Gaza, this draft resolution does not factually reflect the situation in the occupied territory and is therefore far from reflecting the reality in the region.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.6.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.6, entitled “Strengthening security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”, was introduced under agenda item 99 by the representative of Algeria earlier in this meeting. The

sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.6 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.4.

The Chair: The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.6 was adopted.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.