



General Assembly

Sixty-seventh session

First Committee

18th meeting

Friday, 2 November 2012, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Percaya (Indonesia)

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

Agenda items 86 to 102 (continued)

Thematic discussion on item subjects and introduction and consideration of all draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and related international security agenda items

The Chair: Let me start by expressing my heartfelt thanks to all members for their cooperation, flexibility and understanding in positively welcoming and adhering to the proposal I made yesterday, designed to enable us to overcome the setback resulting from the unfortunate conditions. I am delighted to note that while we still have a lot of ground to cover, we made tremendous progress yesterday, having covered the remaining speakers' lists for cluster 4, "Conventional weapons"; cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security"; cluster 6, "Regional disarmament and security"; and the first four speakers on cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". Today we will proceed full steam — and I mean full steam — ahead to finish the speakers' list on "Disarmament machinery" and move on to the action segment and final stage of our work.

Before I open the floor, I would again urge all delegations to continue to adhere to the Sandy formula we agreed yesterday by which all speakers would take one minute to announce their agreement not to make oral statements and instead to submit hard copies of their prepared statements for posting on the First Committee web portal QuickFirst. In that one-minute

statement, I need again to repeat that speakers should indicate if they wish to introduce draft resolutions or decisions. Let me reiterate that this arrangement does not constitute any precedent whatsoever for the work of the Committee.

On that note, I now open the floor to the remaining speakers on the list for cluster 7.

Ms. Sequensová (Czech Republic): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the informal group of observer States to the Conference on Disarmament, a cross-regional group composed of 39 States from all regions.

First, let me express our condolences to the victims of Hurricane Sandy. Secondly, we support the Sandy formula. Thus we request that the full statement be posted on the QuickFirst portal and in the verbatim record and the press release.

To summarize our statement, the membership of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) is rather limited. Its decisions have a global impact. Therefore the members of the Conference on Disarmament should seriously and urgently consider inviting more countries to join the CD, thereby expanding the membership. In this respect, we reiterate our call for the early nomination of a special rapporteur to review the issue of membership of the Conference on Disarmament.

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

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.

12-57083 (E)



Please recycle

Mr. Schmid (Switzerland): My thoughts are still with all those who continue to suffer from the effects of Hurricane Sandy.

My delegation has prepared a national statement to be presented as a contribution to our deliberations on the disarmament machinery. However, given the time constraints, I will abstain from reading it. It will be distributed in written form and I thank the secretariat of the Committee for posting it on QuickFirst. I also request that it be reflected in the verbatim record and press release.

I take this opportunity, however, to introduce, on behalf of the delegations of the Netherlands, South Africa and Switzerland, draft decision A/C.1/67/L.31, entitled "Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations".

As members will recall, last year our three delegations introduced a draft resolution on this same issue. The draft resolution was adopted by consensus by the Committee and subsequently by the General Assembly as resolution 66/66. We note that a number of initiatives are being pursued this year in the First Committee that relate, directly or indirectly, to the work of the Conference on Disarmament (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 whereby the General Assembly would include this item on the agenda of the sixty-eighth session of the First Committee.

We continue to see an urgent need to revitalize the work of the CD and the United Nations disarmament machinery, and will continue to advocate for progress towards this end. On this 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.

Mr. Simon-Michel (France) (*spoke in French*): Following your excellent advice, Sir, the French delegation's written statement will be distributed, and we would also like it to be posted on the QuickFirst website and its substance reflected in the official verbatim record and in the press statement.

In the few moments that I do have, I would refer to the amendments submitted by our Mexican colleague yesterday to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.46. I should

like to echo the sentiments expressed by my colleague from the United States. France believes that setting up a new body, as proposed in paragraph 1, will necessarily have budgetary implications, and we therefore do not understand how the amendment would obviate the need to consider the budgetary implications of establishing the working group.

With regard to operative paragraph 3, we believe that the amendment proposed does indeed heighten the risk that I stressed in my written and electronic statement that the draft resolution will undermine the plan of action adopted by the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Mr. Špokauskas (Lithuania): I shall not keep the Committee long. Lithuania will join the delegations that will not read out their full statements. I hope that our statement is now being distributed. We should be grateful if the Secretariat would post it on the QuickFirst website and also request that the statement be reflected in the press release.

Ms. Anderson (Canada): My delegation asks that our full statement on disarmament machinery be posted on QuickFirst. Canada believes in the potential of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) and United Nations disarmament machinery. However, this does not mean that we will provide it with unconditional support. If the CD remains deadlocked, other options to move the agenda forward should be considered. Canada has put forward draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", which offers a pragmatic and incremental way to make substantive progress on critical issues.

The responsibility to make the CD and United Nations disarmament machinery function lies with all States Members of the United Nations. However, those who extol the virtue of the machinery yet balk at any attempt to reform it are accelerating its decline. We are prepared as a result to cast a critical eye on the current situation and seek ways to realize its potential.

Mr. Moktefi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): We request that our statement be put on the Office for Disarmament Affairs's QuickFirst website.

Algeria continues to attach great importance to the agenda for multilateral disarmament and the strengthening of the disarmament machinery. Given the deadlock in these mechanisms, it is essential that

Member States show the political will necessary to revitalize the disarmament bodies in a lasting and efficient manner. Algeria reaffirms the importance of the role and mandate of the Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission.

Ms. Luts (Estonia): We join others in expressing sympathy to the victims and those affected by the hurricane.

Estonia fully aligns itself with the statement distributed by the European Union, and also with the statement distributed by the Czech Republic on behalf of the informal group of observer States to the Conference on Disarmament.

We remain a strong supporter of a multilateral approach to disarmament and cannot ignore the fact that multilateral disarmament negotiations have not been able to deliver tangible results for too long a time. Being committed to the idea of revitalizing the Conference on Disarmament (CD), my delegation wishes to reiterate its request to participate fully and equally in the disarmament discussions as a full member of the CD. We believe that the expansion of the membership could become an achievement for the CD and raise its relevance.

Following the proposed so-called Sandy formula, we would like to inform the Committee that we are circulating the full version of our statement in paper form and ask that it be posted on the QuickFirst website. We also ask that it be duly reflected in the respective press release.

Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Our delegation also, following your suggestion, Sir, will distribute our statement in written form.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation): I will refrain from making my national statement on the disarmament machinery issue. At the same time I have the privilege of delivering a joint statement on behalf of the interested States in support of the Conference on Disarmament (CD). The following countries associate themselves with this joint statement: Argentina, Armenia, Belarus, Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Syria, Tajikistan and Ukraine.

We reiterate the exclusive importance and significance of the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral negotiating forum that has provided

and continues to provide the framework for negotiating fundamental international disarmament instruments. We strongly believe that the Conference, together with other elements of the United Nations disarmament triad — the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission — has proved its relevance by making a significant practical contribution to maintaining international security and resolving the key issues in the field of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control.

We call for efforts to overcome stagnation in the field of multilateral disarmament. We must thoroughly and consistently search for compromises acceptable to all, taking due account of the national security priorities of each Member State. We believe that no other forum can substitute for the Conference, with its fundamental principle of consensus and its membership, in addressing the complex tasks that it already has on its agenda.

We call on the States participating in the work of the Conference to come to an agreement on a balanced and comprehensive programme and to resume its substantive work on the key agenda issues: nuclear disarmament, a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices, the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, in accordance with its rules of procedure. We call on the States concerned to continue to make every possible effort to find the best possible solutions at the Conference on Disarmament.

This statement is open to other countries to join and will be posted on the QuickFirst website, together with a list of speakers. We also hope that it will be of assistance to the outgoing and incoming Presidents of the Conference on Disarmament in the conduct of their consultations on the programme of work.

Ms. Martínez (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Spanish delegation will not make its planned statement on disarmament machinery. The text will be distributed in the room and sent to the QuickFirst website.

Mr. Van den IJssel (Netherlands): I had asked for the floor earlier to say a few words about draft decision A/C.1/67/L.31, just introduced by our colleague from Switzerland. Heeding your request to be as brief as possible, Sir, I shall limit myself to fully endorsing what he said in his introduction of that draft decision.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): When I took the floor under cluster 4 yesterday, I mentioned that we had planned to make an introductory statement on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.33, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”. For the record, I should like to repeat my request now, under cluster 7, that this statement be posted on the QuickFirst website.

Mr. Tarar (Pakistan): Our full statement is being distributed and will be available on QuickFirst.

We associate ourselves with the statement of the Non-Aligned Movement, delivered by the representative of Indonesia. We also align ourselves with the joint statement made by the representative of Russia in support of the Conference on Disarmament (CD). In this context, I want to clarify that there should be no misunderstanding or ambiguity whatsoever on Pakistan’s position with regard to a fissile material cut-off treaty, which remains unchanged.

To make progress in the CD it is essential to ensure the security concerns of all States. That is the only way to unblock the CD. There have been efforts to explore other options to the CD. In our view such attempts, perhaps well-meaning, are contrary to the recognized international position adopted by consensus that the CD is the single multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament. The CD is not a forum for negotiating only one item on its agenda. There are four core issues on the CD’s agenda. In our view, the CD is eminently ready to negotiate an instrument on negative security assurances.

Mr. Kucer (Slovakia): Slovakia associates itself with the statement of the European Union. Nevertheless, we wish to stress a few points from our national perspective. However, as I did yesterday, in the interests of time I will not deliver my statement. The full version will be circulated and posted on the QuickFirst website. I would ask delegations to refer to the full version of the statement of Slovakia when seeking or referring to the views of my country on issues related to disarmament machinery. I also request that the full statement of my delegation be fully reflected in the respective press release.

Ms. Liufalani (New Zealand): New Zealand’s full statement on disarmament machinery is being circulated, and we ask that it also be placed on the QuickFirst website.

Our full statement expresses New Zealand’s support for greater engagement with civil society in our work, and the importance we place on disarmament and non-proliferation education. It underlines New Zealand’s well-known frustration at the ongoing dysfunction of the United Nations disarmament machinery and our support for all efforts aimed at advancing its effectiveness and disarmament outcomes more broadly. The statement also touches on the importance that New Zealand places on the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research and our interest in ensuring its role and function are by no means lessened as a result of the restructuring proposals currently under consideration.

Mr. Kim (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Chilean delegation associates itself with the statements made by the delegation of Peru on behalf of the countries of the Union of South American Nations, and by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. We have submitted our disarmament machinery statement for posting on the QuickFirst website.

Mr. Gill (India): The full version of our statement will be circulated in the room and posted on the QuickFirst website. I just want to emphasize three quick points. First, we associate ourselves with the statement delivered by the representative of Indonesia on this subject on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Secondly, with regard to the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, we appreciate the efforts of the Chair of this year’s Commission to ensure consensus on the agenda for the next three years. We hope that all member States will engage more seriously in the Commission to provide vitality to its work.

Finally, the Conference on Disarmament (CD), recognized by the General Assembly at its first special session devoted to disarmament as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, continues to have the mandate, the membership, the credibility and the rules of procedure to discharge its responsibility. We do not believe that the continuing impasse in the CD arises from the forum per se or its rules of procedure. There is no design flaw, as CD Secretary-General Mr. Tokayev noted earlier in this session. It is up to the Member States to make the CD work by negotiating multilateral treaties that can be signed, ratified and implemented universally. We believe that proposals which question the viability or relevance of the CD, or even suggest

unrealistic alternatives, need to be viewed with the utmost caution.

Ms. Čubrilo (Serbia): Serbia aligns itself with the statements made on behalf of the European Union and by the representative of the Czech Republic on behalf of the informal group of observer States to the Conference on Disarmament. Our national statement containing some additional remarks has been provided to the Secretariat in the expectation that it will be posted on the QuickFirst website and duly reflected in the press release.

The Chair: I give the floor to the delegation of Nepal to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.32.

Mr. Dhital (Nepal): My delegation joins others in extending heartfelt sympathies and condolences to all the victims of Hurricane Sandy.

My delegation has the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.32 under agenda item 95(f), entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific”. Being host country to the Regional Centre, Nepal pledges its commitment to providing all possible support to the Centre in order to make it an effective primary United Nations regional entity dealing with disarmament and non-proliferation issues in the Asia and Pacific region.

I should like to take this opportunity to express Nepal’s gratitude to Member States for their continued support of the Regional Centre, including voluntary contributions for the programme and activities of the Centre. We are confident that more Member States will come forward to lend their support to the Centre in the days ahead.

My delegation will circulate hard copies of the full version of our statement and ask the Secretariat to place it on the website.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation associates itself with the statements made on this cluster by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and by the Russian Federation on behalf of the interested States. We would like our full national statement on this cluster, “Disarmament machinery”, to be reflected in the press release and on the QuickFirst website.

In short, in our view there is no alternative to the Conference on Disarmament (CD), and the role of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament cannot be replaced by artificial

initiatives. Instead of blaming the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the CD or their consensus role for the current stalemate, the total blame should be placed on those countries that consider these bodies, in particular the CD, as a single issue venue or have blocked any progress on nuclear disarmament therein for a decade.

Mr. Noonan (Ireland): We have circulated our full statement in writing. I would, however, like to highlight the fact that Ireland shares the belief that the United Nations disarmament machinery is badly in need of fresh momentum and a greater sense of purpose and direction. In recent years, it has all too often appeared to be a bystander rather than a participant, even if this appearance is not a fully fair assessment.

I should also like to place on the record our appreciation for the substantial and independent research undertaken by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, which is also part of our disarmament machinery. We very much hope that it will continue to provide this invaluable service to the disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control agenda.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Nigeria who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.56.

Mrs. Effiong-Archibong (Nigeria): My delegation aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The delegation of Nigeria takes the floor to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.56, entitled “United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services”. Established in 1978, the main objectives of the fellowship include raising greater awareness of the importance of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation, and enhancing the capacity of officials from Member States, especially those from developing countries, in order to enable them to participate more effectively in international disarmament deliberating and negotiating forums. Its usefulness has been widely recognized by member States.

In the 34 years since its inception, the fellowship programme has trained more than 800 Government officials from more than 160 Member States in the areas of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation, thereby contributing to the process of deliberations and

negotiations on key disarmament and non-proliferation issues.

The unanimous support of the First Committee for this biennial resolution is fully appreciated. The delegation of Nigeria expresses appreciation to all sponsors and seeks more broad support for the resolution in the future. The draft resolution is still open for sponsorship.

Mr. Román-Morey (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like the record to show our comments on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.5, entitled “Report of the Disarmament Commission”, the chairmanship of which we held during its previous session. We would also like the draft resolution to indicate that it is presented by Peru on behalf of the Bureau of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. We hope, as is the tradition, that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. Eloumni (Morocco): We would just like to say that we will make our statement available on the QuickFirst website but would like to see the following reflected in the press release. First, we associate ourselves with the Non-Aligned Movement statement on this cluster. Secondly, all States should show political will and flexibility to advance the disarmament objective. Thirdly, the real cause of the machinery’s difficulties is not consensus, but rather the interpretation of consensus as unanimity or veto power, as well as the lack of progress in implementing the already existing obligations and commitments. Fourthly, we remain open to all discussions on advancing the disarmament objectives through negotiations, in full respect for the integrity and the mandate of the United Nations disarmament machinery.

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker on the list for cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”, which is also the last cluster. The Committee has thus concluded the thematic segment of its work.

Agenda items 86 to 102 (*continued*)

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

The Chair: The Committee will first consider the draft resolution contained in informal paper 1, which has been circulated among delegations. I hope that all delegations have been able to obtain the document I mentioned yesterday, which addresses the ground rules

for taking action on draft resolutions. If not, I urge them to do so as soon as possible and to familiarize themselves with the rules of procedure outlined therein. It is a tool that I believe all delegations will find very useful in guiding them through the action phase.

As I also mentioned yesterday, during the action phase delegations can take the floor either in the Committee or in plenary meeting of the General Assembly to explain their position or vote in a consolidated manner before or after action on draft resolutions and decisions in a particular cluster. Given the limited time we now have available for concluding our work, I again appeal once more to all delegations intending to speak in such explanation of vote or position kindly to consider doing so in the General Assembly rather than in the Committee. This, I believe, will guarantee that we will finish our work in the time we have left.

Furthermore, during the action phase delegations will have a final opportunity to introduce draft resolutions in the cluster under consideration. again I appeal to those taking advantage of this final opportunity to endeavour to do so in reasonable time. While we await the full restoration of the Secretariat’s document-processing system, e-Doc, which was affected by the hurricane, I continue to encourage delegations needing to introduce revisions to their draft resolutions to do so orally.

As members are aware, the established practice of the Committee for the action phase of its work is to open the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or comments other than explanations of positions or votes on the draft resolutions contained in a specific cluster. Again, with members’ understanding and cooperation, I propose that such statements be reasonable in terms of time.

I should also like to stress that, in accordance with the rules of procedure, the sponsors of draft resolutions may make general statements at the beginning of the consideration of the draft resolutions and decisions under a particular cluster, but may not make statements in explanation of their position or vote before or after action is taken. If for any reason action on draft resolutions and decisions listed in a particular informal paper is not completed during a given meeting, at its next meeting the Committee will first finish action on those remaining drafts before proceeding to take action on a new informal paper.

Concerning the postponement of action on any draft resolution, I urge all delegations to inform the Committee secretariat in advance, at least one day before action is scheduled to be taken, on the draft resolutions on which they wish to postpone action. However, every effort should be made to refrain from resorting to a deferment of action.

While voting is not foreseen on any of the draft resolutions before the Committee today, I strongly appeal to and urge delegations seeking recorded votes on other drafts to be taken up in subsequent meetings kindly to inform the Committee secretariat of their intention as early as possible before the Committee starts taking action on the cluster in question.

I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): May I ask you, Sir, to confirm whether it is indeed the case that you have asked delegations to submit their amendments to draft resolutions orally because of the technical problems related to Hurricane Sandy? That is what I have understood. The Committee's work is normally done on paper. Amendments are submitted in writing and are considered 24 hours later. The oral submission of such amendments is not the standard procedure. Could you kindly explain, Sir?

The Chair: May I repeat what I said earlier that I was not making a ruling. Simply put, while we await the full restoration of the Secretariat's document processing system, e-Doc, which was affected by the hurricane, I continue to appeal to delegations needing to introduce revisions to their draft resolutions to do so orally. With this, I would also like to get more clarification from the Secretariat.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Thank you, Sir, for the opportunity to explain what is happening with documents processing. Efforts are being made to restore full services, but we are still having some problems with the printing of documents because the third basement of the Secretariat building, which contains the printing equipment, is still flooded. Therefore, without infringing on the sovereign right of any delegation to submit amendments or revisions any way it sees fit, the appeal of the Chair was just for those particular revisions that are perhaps not very significant to be submitted orally, which would help the

Secretariat to build up capacity in order to restore full services.

Having said this, the Committee secretariat is ready to assist delegations by making copies of the proposed oral amendments and circulating them in the room so that they will be before delegations when a decision is being taken on the relevant draft resolution. Again, this in no way detracts from the right of any delegation to request any amendment to a draft resolution to be put in writing. The Secretariat will definitely process such requests once they are received.

The Chair: I understand the concern of our Syrian colleague. Can delegations agree that, while we are proceeding on the cluster on which we now have an informal paper, if there is any oral amendment to it then we might defer it until next week? In the meantime, with the Committee's concurrence and its flexibility we might proceed with the voting action process. While we are doing that, if there is any amendment then we might consider it later next week.

May I take it that the Committee agrees with this procedure?

It was so decided.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed in informal paper 1, which has been circulated today, starting with cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons".

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

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", was introduced under agenda item 90 by the representative of Egypt at the 9th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/67/L.1.

The Chair: The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it 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.1 was adopted.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopt.

Mr. Propper (Israel): In line with your request, Sir, I will follow your constructive Sandy formula and shorten my oral statement.

Israel has once again joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.1 entitled “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East” notwithstanding our ongoing substantive reservation regarding certain elements contained in the draft resolution, including the reference to the non-consensual resolution of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) General Conference entitled “Application of IAEA Safeguards in the Middle East”. We have done so as Israel remains committed to a vision of the Middle East developing eventually into a zone free of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons, as well as ballistic missiles. Nonetheless, Israel has always maintained that these issues, like all other such regional security-related issues, can realistically be addressed only within the regional context.

At present, no regional dialogue exists in the Middle East and there is no a forum to develop confidence-building measures and defuse tensions. The Middle East countries have no regional forum in which all can directly communicate with each other and have a dialogue on core issues that affect their security.

In the early 1990s, the arms control and regional security talks were the appropriate forum to promote confidence and address security issues and challenges in the area. Such a mechanism is lacking today in that there is no channel for direct discussion among the States in the Middle East. No majority vote or one-sided resolution in international forums can be a substitute for broad regional dialogue and cooperation. Our vision of what we can do in the space between aspiration and reality begins with the need to establish confidence-building measures and genuine efforts to reduce tension in the area with our neighbours for greater dialogue.

I will cut short my statement and submit hard copy to the Committee secretariat.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation regarding the draft resolution entitled “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East”, contained in document A/C.1/67/L.1.

As is well known, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East was proposed

by Iran in 1974. Since then, every year the General Assembly has adopted resolutions endorsing this proposal. Through such resolutions, the Assembly has recognized that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East would greatly enhance international peace and security. Likewise, the Assembly, in the historic Final Document of its first special session devoted to disarmament in 1978, reaffirmed that

“[p]ending the establishment of such a zone in the region, States of the region should solemnly declare that they will refrain on a reciprocal basis from producing, acquiring or in any other way possessing nuclear weapons and nuclear explosive devices and from permitting the stationing of nuclear weapons on their territory by any third party, and agree to place all their nuclear activities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards” (*resolution S-10/2, para 63(d)*).

However, it is a source of grave concern that despite the repeated calls of the international community — in particular by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, the Review Conference of States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), and the successive summits and ministerial conferences of the Non-Aligned Movement — the only non-party in the region, the Zionist regime, which has officially acknowledged its possession of nuclear weapons and enjoys the full support of the United States and certain Western countries, in particular in the so-called Security Council and elsewhere, has neither acceded to the NPT nor placed its unsafeguarded secret nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the IAEA. Consequently, no progress has been made so far in the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Since the Zionist regime is the only source of threat and the only obstacle to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, we firmly believe that at the 2012 Conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, there should be strong pressure on that regime to eliminate all its nuclear secret weapons, accede to the NPT without any further delay and condition, and, as a nuclear-weapon State non-party, place all its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards in order to pave the way for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

I limit myself to these comments but we will give the full statement to the Secretariat.

The Chair: We have completed action under cluster 1. We shall now move on to cluster 2, “Other weapons of mass destruction”.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.26.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.26, entitled “Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction”, was introduced under agenda item 94 (dd) by the representative of India at the 11th meeting, on 19 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.26 and CRP.3/Rev.1.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it 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.26 was adopted.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I wish to explain the position of my delegation on the draft resolution entitled “Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction”.

As one of the main victims of terrorist acts, the Islamic Republic of Iran has always supported measures to combat terrorism in all its forms and manifestations on a non-discriminatory basis. In pursuit of that principled position, my country has supported this draft resolution since its introduction in the First Committee.

However, the draft resolutions proposed this year and last year contain a reference to the so-called Nuclear Security Summits, a closed selective gathering for a selective approach towards nuclear security based on the assumption that the possession of nuclear weapons by a few countries should be continued and that the only major problem is how to secure the weapons and needed material for the production of such weapons.

A thorough review of the documents of those gatherings indicates that the documents contain not even a single reference to nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons, which is the only

absolute guarantee against the threat to international peace and security posed by nuclear weapons. Furthermore, a nuclear-weapon State that hosted the first of such meetings is used to going outside the United Nations — drafting some documents and coming back to the United Nations for their endorsement — which is a wrong approach to multilateralism in the field of disarmament.

Despite full sympathy with the thrust of the draft resolution, the reference to those gatherings in the current draft resolution obliges my delegation, while joining the consensus, to disassociate itself from the paragraph contained therein on the so-called Nuclear Security Summit.

Mr. Tarar (Pakistan): I take the floor to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.26. My delegation shares the concerns that terrorists and non-State actors may potentially acquire and use weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). We therefore support the objectives of the draft resolution, although we continue to believe that its language could have been improved to convey a more objective reflection of reality.

The fear of the acquisition and use of WMD materials by terrorists and non-State actors needs to be evaluated and viewed in perspective. Terrorist organizations and non-State actors are more likely to acquire and use chemical weapons and biological weapons materials and capabilities. The acquisition and use of nuclear weapons by terrorists and non-State actors is much less likely.

The international community, however, must not lower its guard in preventing the possibility of the development and use of “dirty” bombs. Increased international cooperation, including the initiation of negotiations on a radiological weapons convention, should be given serious consideration. Those concerns should, however, not become an excuse for pursuing a policy of discrimination against selected countries.

With regard to denying terrorists the means to acquire, possess and use WMDs, States have enacted and enforced export-control measures, national physical protection and other related actions to prevent WMD technology from falling into the hands of terrorists. International assistance and capacity-building continue to be important areas of tension.

To lend greater legitimacy to international efforts in that area, interim measures such as the adoption of Security Council resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006), which were designed to fill the gap in international law, need to be taken up by a more inclusive and representative United Nations forum. We agree with the widely held view that the best guarantee against the threat of the possible use of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons lies in their elimination.

The faithful implementation of existing treaty regimes such as the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (CWC) can effectively address most of those threats. An early disarmament of chemical stocks would enhance the confidence level against the likelihood of their acquisition and use by terrorists. However, as long as the process of chemical-weapon disarmament proceeds at a slow pace and huge quantities of chemical weapons exist, the possibility of their falling into terrorist hands will remain as well.

The control of biological weapons should be of more concern, in particular to the industrially advanced States due to the extensive use of biological agents by them. The BWC should therefore be strengthened, including by possibly concluding the verification protocol, which has been negotiated for more than eight years.

We are convinced that the revival of that process would fully serve the goal of promoting international peace and security, as well as address the concerns expressed, for example, in this draft resolution. We are convinced that a comprehensive strategy must be evolved to prevent the possibility of terrorists gaining access to WMDs, which must include depriving terrorist organizations of their operational and organizational capabilities; strengthening the relevant existing multilateral regimes; negotiating a universal treaty to fill the gaps in current international instruments; augmenting the capacity of States to implement global treaty obligations; and addressing the root-causes of terrorism.

A distinction must be maintained between counter-terrorism and non-proliferation. This draft resolution quite appropriately mentions the Final Document (see A/67/506) of the sixteenth Non-Aligned Movement Conference of Heads of State or Government as having expressed itself on the issue on weapons of mass

destruction and terrorism. We would like to remind the Committee that, in the context of the issue of terrorism, the Document also stresses the need to address the causes that sometimes lead to terrorism — causes that lie in suppression, injustice and deprivation.

The Chair: We have completed action on the draft resolution under cluster 2 for today.

We will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution under cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.21.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.21 was introduced under agenda sub-item (s) of agenda item 94, entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them”, by the representative of Mali on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Economic Community of West African States, at the Committee’s 14th meeting, on 23 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.21 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.1.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.21 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee has completed action on the draft resolution under cluster 4 for today.

We will now take action on the draft resolution listed under cluster 5. I shall first give the floor to members who wish to speak in explanation of position before action is taken.

Ms. Adamson (United Kingdom): I should like to deliver an explanation of position on behalf of the United Kingdom and France on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.20, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”.

The United Kingdom and France will join the consensus on the draft resolution. We support the mainstreaming of disarmament issues in development policy, particularly in the field of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. However, we feel it

necessary to make our position clear on other aspects of this text.

The notion of a symbiotic relationship between disarmament and development appears questionable to us, as the conditions conducive to disarmament are not necessarily dependent upon development alone — as seen with the growing military expenditure of the fastest-developing countries. There is no automatic link between the two but, rather, a complex relationship that the draft resolution does not accurately capture.

Moreover, the idea according to which military expenditure directly diverts funding from development requirements would need to be nuanced, as defence investments are also necessary to develop peacekeeping, improve the response to natural disasters, airborne and maritime equipment, and, under certain conditions, to favour stability.

Finally, we consider that the report of the Group of Governmental Experts (see A/59/119) did not give sufficient credit to unilateral, bilateral and multilateral actions in disarmament and non-proliferation.

Ms. Kennedy (United States of America): The United States will not participate in the Committee's action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.20. We do believe that disarmament and development are two very important issues, but we see them as distinct and believe that the link between them is by no means automatic. Accordingly, we do not consider ourselves bound by the 1987 final document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development (resolution 48/75).

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.20.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.20 was introduced under sub-item (p) of agenda item 94, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 1 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A.C.1/67/L.20.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it

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.20 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on the draft decision listed under cluster 6, "Regional disarmament and security".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/67/L.10 was submitted by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia under agenda item 88, entitled "Maintenance of international security — good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe". The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/67/L.10.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/67/L.10 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". We turn first to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.5.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.5 was introduced by the representative of Peru under sub-item (b) of agenda item 96, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission", on behalf of the members of the Bureau of the Disarmament Commission at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 25 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/67/L.5.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it 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.5 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.14.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.14 was introduced under

sub-item (c) of agenda item 95, entitled “United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament” by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the Committee’s 17th meeting, on 1 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/67/L.14.

This draft resolution is accompanied by an oral statement by the Secretariat. With the Chair’s permission, I shall read the text 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 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.14, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide all necessary support, within existing resources, to the regional centres in carrying out their programmes of activities.

The implementation of that request would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. The provision contained therein covers the three Directors’ posts, P-5, three Political Affairs Officers, P-3, and four General Service Administrative Assistants of the regional centres, and also includes general operating costs of the centres. The programmes of activities of the three regional centres would continue to be financed from extra-budgetary resources.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.14, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section B VI of resolution 45/248, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 66/246, of 24 December 2011, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it 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.14 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee has completed action today on clusters 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

I now give the floor to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): As we agreed at the beginning, Mr. Chair, we said that we would speak on the issue you raised, Sir, once the Committee had taken action on the drafts before. I believe that we have now in fact taken action on the drafts.

With regard to the issue of amendments to drafts, we fully understand the current situation. But that can in no way mean that we will agree to oral amendments here. In exceptional circumstances, we may accept that amendments to draft resolutions such as A/C.1/67/L.1 or A/C.1/67/L.2 could be placed on the website so that we could find our own way to those documents and then send transmit them to capitals to seek instructions. Any amendment will require instructions.

If there is any draft to be amended on the list that you, Sir, have distributed, I kindly ask that action be deferred until Tuesday, not Monday. I look forward to your response and ruling, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: I have taken note of the need for delegations to report and seek clarification or instruction from their capitals. I fully understand the problem. Certainly, we will take each case into consideration as it arises: if there are any oral amendments to the draft resolutions referred to by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic — perhaps one or two on Monday — and there is a need for some delegations to get instructions from their capitals. I take note of his earlier intervention.

I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Thank you for this opportunity, Mr. Chair, to further explain the procedure related to the proposal for amendments to draft resolutions.

It is the right of any delegation, when it hears oral revisions or amendments from the floor, to request the Secretariat to produce those changes in writing as a revised draft resolution, or agree to take them up orally. It is also the prerogative of the presiding officer to put it to the Committee immediately or to wait for the revised document to be published by the Secretariat. That in no

way detracts from the right of any delegation to put a proposal or call for a vote on the draft resolution.

I should like to explain the difference between revisions and amendments. A revision normally comes from the sponsors of a draft resolution, while amendments normally are introduced by delegations that are not sponsors of the draft resolution. That is the distinction we make in the Secretariat.

Delegations have the right to request that amendments appear in all the official languages and be available as a formal document of the Committee.

As I said earlier, the presiding officer has the right to put oral revisions or amendments to the Committee immediately or to postpone taking action on them, with the agreement of the Committee.

The Chair: I should like to offer a solution based on two considerations.

First, the draft resolutions on which the Committee is going to take action on Monday are already on paper. In the spirit of goodwill, I would like to encourage those delegations that are going to put forward amendments to share them with us as soon as possible so that the Secretariat can do its best to share them with Member States in advance.

Secondly, each amendment should be judged on its merit. For example, if the amendment is just a change of date, I would not see that as very significant. But when an amendment alters or changes the substantive part of any particular draft resolution, then I do understand the concern and need for some countries to consult their capitals and seek instructions. I hope that my colleague from the Syrian Arab Republic will agree with my offered solution.

I now give the floor to the representative of the United Kingdom.

Ms. Adamson (United Kingdom): I am looking at informal paper 2, which has been kindly distributed to us for the next round of draft resolutions. I note that under the “Conventional weapons” cluster that “towards an arms trade treaty” is not included in that cluster. I should very much like to know from you, Sir, or the Secretariat why that is. My understanding is that we submitted the draft resolution a day before the deadline, and nothing has changed in the draft resolution since then. There are no amendments. We had also understood that the information on the programme budget implications had

already been discussed. We therefore had hoped that it might be possible to deal with the arms trade treaty not in the category of those others that were still under consideration for programme budget implications, but to recognize that we put our draft resolution in ahead of time and we wondered if it would be possible to take action. There are more than 90 sponsors of the draft resolution. We would like to be in a position to tell them when the vote will take place.

The Chair: To the best of my understanding, we have not received a document on programme budget implications.

I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): I check my e-mail religiously. Whenever I receive a text from the Office of Programme Planning Budget and Accounts, I immediately instruct my colleagues to put it on the website. Unfortunately, I was not able to check my e-mail, as I was on the rostrum, but I will check it. As soon as we receive it, we will definitely take action as requested. But we do need to have a formal document on the budgetary implications in order to act. Members should understand our predicament. We can base our decisions only on facts and on a document that we actually receive, rather than a promise that the document will be sent. As soon as we get the document, we will immediately share it with delegations and consult with the Chair on how to take action.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of the United Kingdom.

Ms. Adamson (United Kingdom): I want to thank colleagues in the Secretariat for all the work they are doing under very trying circumstances. We do understand that these are unusual circumstances.

Whenever the vote is scheduled, it would be most useful to know ahead when that might be, even if it is not Monday, so that we can make sure the sponsors know well ahead of time. Many people are having trouble getting into Manhattan, and we want to make sure that all sponsors are able to be here to press the voting button.

I want to thank everyone again for all their efforts.

The Chair: I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): The representative of the United Kingdom is right. We are working under some stress, and the budget people have been unable to access their computers and files for three days, which has definitely caused some delay. I assure members that they are working round the clock to make up for the missing time. As soon as we get the documents, we will schedule it the vote. We can schedule these documents right away, on the understanding that if we do not get a programme budget implication document, then the draft resolution will not be acted upon until we do.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): Following your recommendation on the issue of the revisions and amendments, Mr. Chair, I should like to reconfirm that what we understand about the revision of a draft resolution and making an amendment from the floor is different. Indeed, the rules of procedure give each delegation the right to propose an amendment to a draft resolution. What has been discussed here was about the revision of a draft resolution. If delegations that are sponsors of a draft resolution have a revision, we encourage them to send it to the Secretariat so that the Secretariat can distribute it through email and delegations can get instructions, if needed, from their capitals.

However, that does not prejudge the issue of making an amendment from the floor. That is provided for in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): We will definitely distinguish between amendments that were made by some delegations beforehand and those that are made spontaneously on the floor of the Committee.

I should also like to bring to the Committee's attention the fact that, during the introduction of some of the draft resolutions, some delegations have already made oral revisions from the floor, which did not meet with any request from any delegation to be published as a separate document.

My understanding was simply that those draft resolutions were acceptable to delegations. However, when we reach the action phase will be the time to test

whether those revisions or amendments are acceptable to all delegations.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): The Secretary said that he heard no request. However, some minutes ago I did have a comment and did ask that if there were any amendments to any draft, whatever they may be, that they at least be uploaded to the website of the Committee in the form of a Rev.1 or Rev.2, so that we can deal with them and send them to our capitals to obtain instructions. I hope that is the case for all drafts, whether sponsors did or did not so request, or if they are to do so thereafter, so that things remain clear in our methods of work.

The Chair: The point is duly taken.

The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Monday, 5 November. As indicated earlier by the Secretary, we will have back-to-back meetings on that day, at 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. I should also like to take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Román-Morey for his generosity and kindness to the Committee.

While that does not accord with the initial work programme and timetable intended to guide the work of the Committee this year, the severe time constraints that Hurricane Sandy has inflicted on us has necessitated this change. That will ensure that we can conclude our work, we hope, in a timely fashion and that delegations heading home will not have to incur additional costs to adjust their travel and accommodation arrangements.

On Monday we will continue to take action on the draft resolutions and decisions before the Committee. I believe that the Secretariat has circulated informal paper 2, which contains the list of the drafts to be considered on Monday in the light of our previous discussion on the issue of amendments.

I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform delegations that the QuickFirst website is fully operational. We expect delegations that have not yet done so to send us their statements made today as soon as possible, in the expectation that we will place them as soon as possible on the website so that they will be available to all delegations.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.