



# General Assembly

Sixty-seventh session

## First Committee

**22**<sup>nd</sup> meeting

Wednesday, 7 November 2012, 10 a.m.  
New York

Official Records

*Chair:* Mr. Percaya ..... (Indonesia)

*The meeting was called to order at 10.25 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:** I shall now give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements other than in explanation of vote or to introduce draft resolutions under cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”, as contained in informal paper 4. I understand the need for delegations to take the floor, but I kindly appeal to delegations to deliver their statements within a reasonable limit of time.

**Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba)** (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to make a general statement under cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”.

As one of its sponsors, Cuba fully supports draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.19, entitled “High-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”, which was introduced by the delegation of Indonesia on behalf of the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement. This new initiative in favour of convening a high-level meeting on nuclear disarmament in September 2013 is in keeping with the long-standing stance of the Non-Aligned Movement championing nuclear disarmament. The objective of achieving the total elimination of nuclear weapons is our position both at the national level and as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement. We believe that nuclear disarmament is and must remain the highest priority in disarmament, as

established at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Sixty-six years since the General Assembly issued the call in its first resolution (resolution 1 (I)) for the elimination of nuclear weapons, and more than 40 years since the adoption of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, more than 20,000 such weapons still exist, and 5,000 are ready for immediate use, posing a latent threat to international peace and security.

It is unacceptable that certain nuclear-weapon States refuse to renounce the use of such weapons as part of their security doctrines based on so-called nuclear deterrence. Yet worse is the fact that many millions of dollars are spent on developing programmes to modernize nuclear arsenals. Cuba believes that the only guarantee against the use of nuclear weapons, whether by States or any other party, would be their absolute eradication and prohibition, under strict international control.

As is well known, high-level meetings have been held at Headquarters on various topics related to disarmament and its machinery. In that context, draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.19 proposes that a high-level meeting dedicated specifically to nuclear disarmament be held on 26 September 2013, to coincide with the high-level segment of the General Assembly so as to facilitate the highest level of participation. Such a high-level meeting would provide an opportunity for discussion on this crucially important topic, and send a political message to the international community regarding the commitment of the States Members of

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.

12-57687 (E)



Please recycle

the United Nations to achieving the objective of a world free of nuclear weapons.

We hope that the draft resolution will enjoy the overwhelming support of the States represented here, as we believe that the High-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament will be an opportunity to promote the efforts of the international community to achieve the goal of nuclear disarmament.

**The Chair:** I call on the representative of the Republic of Korea to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23.

**Mr. Shin Dong Ik** (Republic of Korea): I would like to introduce, under cluster 1, draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”. The Code celebrates its tenth anniversary in November.

Since its launch in 2002, The Hague Code of Conduct has contributed to transparency and confidence-building in space and in ballistic missile activities, with the subscribing States submitting pre-launch notifications and annual declarations. The General Assembly adopted resolutions 60/62, 63/54 and 65/73 on The Hague Code of Conduct in 2005, 2008 and 2010, respectively, recognizing it as a practical step against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

While the content of the new draft resolution is similar to that of resolution 65/73 of 2010, there have been some positive modifications, including the recognition that 2012 marks a decade since the Assembly’s creation of The Hague Code of Conduct in paragraph 1, the welcoming of the advancement of the universalization process of the Code of Conduct in paragraph 3, and the mentioning of the Code’s relationship with the United Nations in paragraph 7.

The draft resolution submitted this year was agreed upon by the 134 subscribing States of The Hague Code of Conduct at its eleventh regular meeting in Vienna earlier this year and was sponsored by more than 80 States members of the First Committee.

My delegation would like to take this opportunity to request Member States to renew their commitment to ballistic missile non-proliferation by supporting the draft resolution and to sanction the further development of The Hague Code of Conduct on the occasion of its tenth anniversary.

**The Chair:** Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”, I call on representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting.

**Mr. Kang Myong Chol** (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea): The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea intends to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”, because we believe that South Korea has no qualification or moral grounds to sponsor such a draft resolution. It is absolutely hypocritical and absurd that South Korea, which is currently engaged in missile proliferation under the patronage of the United States, has submitted the draft resolution to this Committee.

Only last month, South Korea begged the United States for permission to upgrade and extend its missile range, with the intended purpose of hostility towards the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. The United States, by giving the green light to South Korea, further instigated the inter-Korean confrontation and triggered a missile arms race in North-East Asia, let alone undermining the authority of the Missile Technology Control Regime. Without the permission of the United States, South Korea cannot develop its missile capability on its own because, as far as military matters are concerned, the Republic of Korea is at the beck and call of the United States. South Korea does not have even the wartime military operational control of all sovereign States.

For the past few decades, South Korea has persistently begged the United States for approval and the transfer of technology to upgrade its missile capability. It is very ironic that South Korea is behaving like a forerunner in international efforts to curb missile proliferation. It reminds me of one of Aesop’s fables — “The ass in the lion’s skin”. Fine clothes might disguise the true nature, but silly behaviour will soon disclose it. That is all I have to say.

**The Chair:** We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.9.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Cherniavsky** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.9, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons”, was introduced under agenda item 94 (aa) by the representative of Malaysia at the 10th

meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.9 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, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, 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, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Marshall Islands,

Micronesia (Federated States of), Montenegro, Norway, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

*Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.9 was adopted by 123 votes to 23, with 25 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Denmark informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.]

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.19.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Cherniavsky** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.19, entitled "High-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament", was introduced under agenda item 94 (ee) by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the 9th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in the document A/C.1/67/L.19.

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.19 is accompanied by an oral statement of the Secretary-General, which, with the permission of the Chair, I will now read out.

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, 3 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.19, the General Assembly would, respectively, decide to convene a high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament that will be held as a one-day plenary meeting on 26 September 2013, to contribute to achieving the goal of nuclear disarmament; request the President of the General Assembly, in collaboration with Member States, to make all the necessary arrangements for the high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament; request also the President of the General Assembly to prepare a summary as the outcome of the high-level meeting, which will be issued as a document of the General Assembly.

It is anticipated that the requests contained in paragraphs 1 and 3 of the draft resolution for the convening of the high-level meeting will require two meetings in all six official languages. These two meetings will constitute an addition to the meeting workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, which would also entail additional requirements in the amount of \$21,900

for meetings in 2013. Furthermore, the request for documentation contained in paragraph 5 will constitute an addition to the documentation workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management for one document per session of 500 words and post-session 8,700 words in all six languages. That would entail additional requirements in the amount of \$55,200 for the documentation services in 2013.

No provision has been included under the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 for the activities and, as such, an additional allocation of funds would be required.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.19, additional requirements of \$77,100 would arise under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management", of the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. However, all possible effort would be made to absorb the additional requirements of \$77,100 within the existing resources under section 2 and to report thereon in the context of the second performance report for the biennium 2012-2013.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), 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, 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, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, 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, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, 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, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.19 was adopted by 165 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

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

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Cherniavsky** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation", was introduced today under agenda item 94 (1) by the representative of the Republic of Korea. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in the document A/C.1/67/L.23 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, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam,

Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia

*Against:*

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of)

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

*Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23 was adopted by 151 votes to 2, with 21 abstentions.*

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

**The Chair:** I now call on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position after the vote.

**Mr. Farghal** (Egypt): I take the floor to explain Egypt's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation".

The Hague Code of Conduct is a product of exclusive export control regimes developed outside the United Nations in a discriminatory manner. Egypt believes that, in addition to its voluntary and non-verifiable nature, the Code is neither balanced in its approach nor comprehensive in its scope. The Code focuses on the issue of ballistic missiles, while ignoring more advanced means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction, such as cruise missiles. Since its adoption, it has failed significantly to develop in a manner that can address the aforementioned weaknesses and shortcomings.

We believe that any consideration of the issue of missiles can take place only in the context of the United Nations if it is to enjoy legitimacy and effectiveness. Therefore, Egypt again this year sponsored draft decision A/C.1/67/L.7, entitled "Missiles", in the aim of keeping the missile issue on the agenda of the General Assembly in an inclusive and comprehensive manner within the multilateral context of the United Nations.

**Mr. Ermakov** (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation would like to take the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation". The Russian Federation has consistently advocated increasing the effectiveness of the Code and welcomes all efforts towards its universalization. We of course supported draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23. We once again reiterate our clear intention to bolster that forum within the international non-proliferation regime as an appropriate instrument for enhancing transparency and confidence-building.

Between May 2011 and May 2012, Russia provided 63 notifications of missile launches, which was the highest among subscriber States of the Code that are actively carrying out such launches. Responsibly complying with our obligations under The Hague Code of Conduct, the Russian Federation is concerned to note that some States, while claiming that they want to strengthen the forum and bring its work to a new level by including new countries, are in fact undertaking activities that do not positively promote the Code's development.

We would like to warn that the inappropriate political steps taken by some States run counter to the spirit of the Code and could seriously undermine efforts to universalize that important forum.

**Mr. Magalhães** (Brazil): Although Brazil has not adhered to The Hague Code of Conduct against ballistic missile proliferation, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23. We did so because we acknowledge and respect the fact that 134 States have already subscribed to the Code as a practical step against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means.

We also agree with the significance of regional and international efforts to prevent and curb comprehensively the proliferation of ballistic missile systems capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, as a contribution to international peace and security, as noted in the third preambular paragraph. Furthermore, we welcome the view expressed in the eighth preambular paragraph that States should not be excluded from using the benefits of space for peaceful purposes.

That said, Brazil believes that the construction of an effective and equitable international order depends essentially on sound international law on the basis of legally binding commitments. We also anticipate that an initiative such as The Hague Code of Conduct could evolve and give rise to the negotiation of a legal instrument of universal character that establishes clear obligations and rights for all States. Brazil would hope that such an instrument could also adequately address the question of international cooperation, which is of the utmost importance to developing countries.

**Mr. Pollard** (United Kingdom): I wish to explain my delegation's abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.19, entitled "High-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament".

We question the value of holding a high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament when there are already sufficient venues for such discussion in the First Committee, at the United Nations Disarmament Commission and within the Conference on Disarmament.

We are puzzled about how such a high-level meeting will further the goals of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Action Plan that was agreed by consensus in 2010. In our view, the road

map of actions agreed at that time offers the best way to take forward the multilateral nuclear disarmament agenda, along with the related issues. We continue to believe that nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament are mutually reinforcing. We therefore regret that this high-level meeting does not treat both of those aspects in a balanced manner.

**Mr. Bravaco** (United States of America): I wish to explain my delegation's abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.19, entitled "High-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament". The United States was unable to support the draft resolution for the substantive reasons already set out by the delegation of the United Kingdom in its explanation of vote, with which our delegation associates itself.

In addition, the oral statement pertaining to the draft resolution, which we saw for the first time yesterday evening, indicates that, if the General Assembly were to adopt the draft resolution, additional requirements of \$77,100 would arise under section, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management", of the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. This is not a complaint, as we greatly appreciate how hard everyone in the Secretariat has been working under trying circumstances as a result of Hurricane Sandy setting things back. However, we and others have expressed concerns in this and other venues about the volume of potential add-ons to the 2012-2013 regular budget.

Although the cost in this instance is not large, taken together with the cost of other newly proposed activities, the total impact on the United Nations budget is significant. Therefore, we welcome the commitment of the Secretariat to make every effort to absorb those costs within the level of resources previously approved by Member States.

**Mr. Lindell** (Sweden): My delegation wishes to make a few very short remarks in order to clarify its position on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.9, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons".

Sweden voted in favour of the draft resolution. We would, however, like to make a comment with regard to the fifteenth preambular paragraph. In that paragraph, the General Assembly takes note of the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention (see A/62/650, annex). Sweden believes that that is done without prejudice to any future

negotiating process on a nuclear weapons convention and in the context of separate and mutually reinforcing instruments.

**Mrs. Ledesma Hernández** (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”.

Like previous delegations, Cuba abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Our country has previously expressed its objection to the lack of transparency and the selective manner in which negotiations on the Code of Conduct took place. The Code was adopted and approved in a process that took place outside of the context of the United Nations and without taking into account all the interested States.

Cuba is of the view that the issue of missiles in all its aspects should and must indeed be examined within the United Nations framework in an inclusive and transparent manner, avoiding selective or discriminatory approaches. All interested Member States have the legitimate right to participate openly in all phases of the consideration of the subject and in the adoption of practical measures in that respect.

The Code of Conduct has significant deficits and shortcomings and does not appropriately reflect the main interests of a large group of countries. Among the problems are the following. The Code does not address the issue of the peaceful uses of missile technology, nor does it address the need for cooperation in that area in order to address the specific needs of developing countries. Its focus is restricted to the horizontal dimension of proliferation and completely ignores vertical proliferation. We believe that a comprehensive, non-discriminatory, balanced analysis of the issue of missiles requires going beyond horizontal proliferation to include other aspects of vertical proliferation that are equally important, such as design, development, tests and deployment.

The Code also omits the most serious problem of all, namely, the presence and ongoing development of nuclear weapons, of which ballistic missiles are only a delivery system. The Code refers to ballistic missiles but not to other types of missiles, in spite of their relevance. The Code has also failed to address other issues related to assistance and cooperation that must be duly taken into account when addressing the issue of missiles.

Cuba is fully committed to non-proliferation in all its aspects, from weapons of mass destruction to their means of delivery, including ballistic missiles. We remain convinced that the legally binding instruments that have been negotiated on a multilateral basis are the best and, in the long term, the only instruments that are truly effective in addressing disarmament and non-proliferation matters, including the issue of ballistic missile proliferation.

**Mr. Hallak** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23.

The Syrian Arab Republic emphasizes its complete commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and to multilateral collective action within the framework of the United Nations on the effective implementation of the disarmament machinery with a view to eliminating weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons at all levels, taking specific, clear-cut measures to control nuclear weapons, and preserving the right to self-defence as provided for in Article 51 of the Charter.

Some States proceed to conclude instruments outside the United Nations, which considerably compromises the non-proliferation and disarmament machinery and runs counter to the objective of non-proliferation and disarmament.

The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missiles Proliferation is selective and discriminatory. It focuses on one type of missile — the self-propelled missile — and does not refer in any way to other categories of missiles, keeping the latter as the preserve and monopoly of one or a few States. The Code does not touch on proliferation per se, but does look into the reasons leading to that proliferation. It is noteworthy that the Code is inimical to United Nations multilateralism. The Committee has adopted draft decision A/C.1/67/L.7, entitled “Missiles”, which focuses comprehensively on this matter from all angles in the framework of the United Nations and without discrimination and selectivity.

For all of these reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23.

**Mr. Amano** (Japan): I wish to explain Japan’s position on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.9, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use*

of *Nuclear Weapons*”, on which Japan abstained in the voting.

Due to the immense destructive power and lethal force of nuclear weapons, Japan believes that their use clearly does not comply with the spirit of humanitarianism, which has its philosophical foundation in international law. Nevertheless, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, as set out in the draft resolution under discussion, demonstrates the complexity of the issue. Japan supports the unanimous conclusion of the judges of the International Court of Justice that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament.

On the other hand, we are convinced that realistic measures are required in order to achieve steady progress in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. It is from that point of view that we consider it premature to call upon all States immediately to fulfil that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations leading to the early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention.

**Mr. Wilson** (Australia): I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the following Member States: Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and my own country, Australia, to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.19, entitled “High-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”.

Our countries are resolved to seek a safer world for all and to achieve the peace and security of world without nuclear weapons in accordance with the objectives of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We agree that that goal is worthy of continued high-level political attention. For that reason, we welcome the attention that the Secretary-General continues to give to our collective goal, and it is also for that reason that we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.19.

Because nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing processes, we look forward to discussing both, including in the context of implementing the outcome of the 2010

Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT at the high-level meeting next September.

**Mr. Roche** (France) (*spoke in French*): I have taken the floor in order to explain France’s abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.19, entitled “High-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”.

We question the added value of convening a high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament, given that we already have forums appropriate for engaging such an exchange, including the First Committee, the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament. Moreover, we are bewildered by the manner in which this high-level meeting might advance the plan of action of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons that was agreed upon by consensus in 2010. In our view, that road map already offers the best way possible to promote the nuclear disarmament agenda and related matters.

We remain of the view that nuclear proliferation poses the most serious threat to peace and security, and we regret that the high-level meeting would not address the two aspects of disarmament and non-proliferation in a balanced manner.

**Mr. Hashmi** (Pakistan): I take the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”.

During the discussions that led to the evolution of the Code, Pakistan stressed that the issue of missiles was complex. It was therefore important to address it in a duly constituted multilateral forum so that the views and concerns of all States could be taken on board. While we acknowledge that some effort was made to accommodate the concerns of participating States, the final product — given the ad hoc nature of the forum in which The Hague Code of Conduct was negotiated and the lack of proper deliberations — could not gain the support and acceptance of several missile-possessor States. As a country that was obliged to respond to the missile threat that arose in our region, The Hague Code of Conduct did not address our security concerns.

Notwithstanding our reservations on the process and certain elements of its substance, Pakistan’s State practice has consistently demonstrated its commitment

to the objective of the non-proliferation of missiles and the transparency of confidence-building measures.

For these reasons, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

**Mr. Cassidy** (Indonesia): Indonesia has requested the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”.

We decided to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution. While the aim of the draft resolution is noble in its effort to avert the increased regional and global security challenges caused, inter alia, by the ongoing proliferation of ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, that noble aim by itself, in our view, does not suffice or lead to ensuring increased security for all countries.

The best way to establish broad international norms in that area will be through negotiating a legally binding instrument that prohibits the proliferation of ballistic missiles and reaches out to all concerned States. The development of such an instrument should be inclusive, involving all concerned countries. It is very important that such a regime contain a provision on international cooperation and assistance in the area of rocketry for peaceful uses. Concrete work in this direction will give the vast majority of developing countries an incentive to join such efforts.

**Mrs. Parkar** (India): My delegation takes the floor to explain its abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”.

India is fully committed to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, including ballistic missiles. The proliferation of ballistic missiles in our region has adversely impacted India’s security. This issue is complex, inter alia, because there is no global legal regime governing the possession and use of missiles, and the development and modernization of advanced weapon systems continues. This complexity demands that any initiative to address concerns related to ballistic missile proliferation should be inclusive, sustainable and comprehensive.

We welcome the fact that the last Panel of Governmental Experts on missiles in all its aspects, whose members included representatives of several sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.23, emphasized in its report (see A/63/176) the important role of the

United Nations in providing a more structured and effective mechanism to build consensus.

We acknowledge that 134 States consider The Hague Code of Conduct to be a practical confidence-building and transparency measure. Although India does not subscribe to The Hague Code of Conduct, we are willing to study it in the context of assurances that subscription does not entail restrictions on the testing and deployment of ballistic missiles on national security grounds, and that the use of space launch vehicles would remain unaffected by the Code guideline on exercising maximum restraint in such activities.

**Mr. Najafi** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation regarding draft resolution A/1/67/L.23, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”.

My delegation believes that The Hague Code of Conduct basically suffers from procedural flaws. It was drafted and endorsed outside the United Nations in a selective, unbalanced and non-comprehensive manner and therefore does not represent a fully negotiated text. There is a lack of transparency between the Code and its relationship with the non-transparent club of the Missile Technology Control Regime as well.

The Hague Code of Conduct also has several substantive shortcomings. First, the text contains no disarmament perspective and, through this discrimination, acknowledges the possession of ballistic missiles by a few States while aiming to discourage others from obtaining them, irrespective of their reasons for doing so. Second, the Code has exclusively focused on ballistic missiles and failed to address other kinds of missiles, particularly cruise missiles, which have been used, coincidentally, by staunch supporters of the Code in recent years more than any other type of missiles. Third, it has failed to provide a definition of what constitutes ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, thereby leaving it up to a few countries to interpret it arbitrarily on the basis of political considerations. Fourth, the text does not offer a distinction between space-launch vehicle programmes and ballistic missile programmes, making the former also subject to arbitrary unilateral interpretation. Fifth, the text has vague and restrictive language with regard to assistance and cooperation in the area of space launch vehicles. Sixth, the important issue of the development of ballistic missiles by States that already possess them has not been addressed in comparison with the proliferation aspects. In fact, The

Hague Code of Conduct is silent about the vertical proliferation of ballistic, as well as cruise missiles. Seventh and last but not least, the right of all States to peaceful applications of space, including having access to the necessary technology for space launch vehicles, has been overlooked or neglected.

There was a promise by the Chair of The Hague Code of Conduct in 2005 to have a substantive and positive consideration of the amendments presented by the non-subscribing States. Nevertheless, since then we have noticed no substantive change in the draft resolution; even worse, some explicit and implicit references to Security Council resolutions have been added to the text, concerning which the Non-Aligned Movement has strong reservations, in particular resolution 1887 (2009). Therefore, my delegation was obliged once again to vote against this draft text.

Finally, I would like to stress that we believe that the issue of missiles in all its aspects should be considered in the context of the United Nations, and for that reason we proposed a draft decision on missiles, which was adopted by consensus by the Committee on 5 November.

**Mr. D'Antuono** (Italy): I take the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.19, entitled "High-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament".

My delegation subscribes entirely to the statement delivered by the representative of Australia in explanation of vote on the draft resolution. Nevertheless, Italy wishes to subscribe also to the statement made by the delegation of the United States of America regarding the financial and budgetary implications of the draft resolution and, in particular, to echo the encouragement given to the Secretariat to make every effort to avoid additional costs to the regular budget of the United Nations for the biennium 2012-2013.

**The Chair:** We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the vote on cluster 1.

The Committee will now move on to address cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction".

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.29.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Cherniavsky** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.29, entitled "Convention

on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction", was introduced under agenda item 101 by the representative of Hungary at the 13th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is named in document A/C.1/67/L.29.

At the 13th meeting of the Committee, the delegation of Hungary informed us of a typographical error in the last line of paragraph 10 of the draft resolution. The word "meeting" should be in the plural, thus becoming "meetings of States parties".

Also, the draft resolution is accompanied by an oral statement of the Secretariat which, with the Chair's permission, I will now read.

This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Under the terms of paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.29, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to render the necessary assistance to the depositary Governments of the Convention, to provide such services that may be required for the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Review Conferences, to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services that may be required for the meetings of experts and the meetings of States parties during the 2012-2015 intersessional programme.

The Secretary-General wishes to draw the attention of Member States to the fact that the States parties to the Convention, at the Seventh Review Conference in December 2011, approved the cost estimate prepared by the Secretariat for servicing the meetings of experts and the meetings of States parties of the 2012-2015 intersessional programme. It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties that, under their respective legal arrangements, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties to the Convention. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.29 would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 and the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

**The Chair:** The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.29 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote, as orally revised. If I

hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee will act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.29, as orally revised, was adopted.*

**The Chair:** I now give the floor to delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of position on the draft resolution just adopted.

**Mr. Najafi** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation regarding draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.29, entitled “Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction”, as orally revised.

As a State party to the Convention, the Islamic Republic of Iran joined the consensus in adopting the draft resolution. Nevertheless, my delegation is dissatisfied with the content of the draft resolution and believes that, despite extensive changes in the size and substance of the draft due to the selective approach by the sponsor, it does not reflect the consensual Final Document of the Seventh Review Conference of the States Parties to the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) in a comprehensive and balanced manner.

In some cases, even the language of the Final Document of the Seventh BWC Review Conference has been selected and modified in an unacceptable manner. For instance, while the Conference, referring to the Convention’s article X on international cooperation and assistance — the most important aspect for developing States parties — in paragraphs 51 and 53 of its Final Declaration

“[r]ecogniz[es] the fundamental importance of enhancing international cooperation, assistance and exchange in biological sciences and technology for peaceful purposes [and] reaffirms the commitment to the full and comprehensive implementation of this article by all States Parties... [and] urges all States Parties possessing advanced biotechnology to adopt positive measures to promote technology transfer and international cooperation on an equal and non-discriminatory basis, particularly with countries less advanced in this field” (*BWC/CONF.VII/7, paras. 51 and 53*),

the draft resolution, in its sixth preambular paragraph and paragraph 7, refers only to

“the importance of ongoing efforts by States Parties to enhance international cooperation [and] [e]ncourages States Parties to provide, at least biannually, appropriate information on their implementation of article X of the Convention”.

We believe that the adoption of a selective approach in revising the draft resolution on such an important issue, particularly following a successful Review Conference and the adoption of a consensual Final Document, is not constructive.

My delegation engaged in a constructive manner in the informal consultations on the draft resolution and, while showing maximum flexibility in regard to the proposed texts by the sponsor and others, put forward concrete proposals taken precisely from the Final Document of Seventh Review Conference. However, unfortunately, in the case of issues related to international cooperation and assistance, those proposals were not taken into account by the sponsor of the draft resolution. While we appreciate the efforts of the sponsor, we hope that next year more efforts will be exerted to revise the draft resolution in a balanced manner.

Finally, I would like to reiterate that the draft resolution is acceptable to my delegation only to the extent that it is in line with the Biological Weapons Convention and the Final Document of the Seventh Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention.

**The Chair:** I now give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements other than explanations of vote or to introduce draft resolutions under cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”.

**Mr. Seruhere** (United Republic of Tanzania): I raised the plaque of my delegation under cluster 4 today and yesterday. In so doing, I wanted to invite the United Nations, the international community and all people of goodwill to make use of the cost-effective technology of SUA-APOPO, which uses rats to detect anti-personnel mines because the rats weigh far less than the weight required to detonate a bomb. For humanitarian reasons, that is a worthy cause.

Secondly, I want to express support for and request the delegations that are present to support draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, entitled “The arms trade treaty”.

**Mr. Pollard** (United Kingdom): I would like to make a few general remarks on behalf of the 103

sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, entitled “The arms trade treaty”, which was introduced during the conventional weapons debate by my colleague from Costa Rica.

It has been a tiring and trying time for us all during this session of the First Committee, especially in the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy, which severely disrupted our work. We are thankful to both the Chair and the Secretariat for the job they have done in the light of these circumstances. We were expecting a budgetary statement on this draft resolution much earlier in the proceedings, which would have allowed delegations the allotted time to carefully consider the financial implications contained in draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11. Unfortunately, due to the disruption caused by the hurricane, we received the document (A/C.1/67/L.60) only this morning, and I believe it has been circulated to all representatives.

As we do not have the time normally allowed to consider this in accordance with the General Assembly’s rules of procedure, and given the circumstances in which we have found ourselves operating this year, I would appeal to all delegations that we proceed to take action on A/C.1/67/L.11, abiding by the so-called Sandy formula, which means that this is merely a measure to assist us in completing the work in a timely manner and in no way constitutes a precedent for our future work.

Let me once again thank the Chair and the Secretariat for their work, and I hope all delegations can accept this request so that we can finish our work today and, hopefully, pending the weather, we can return home.

**Mr. Eloumni** (Morocco): Transparency in armaments is an important confidence-building measure. That is why we support the United Nations Register and the work of the Group of Governmental Experts that convened last year and was supposed to reconvene next year. We should, however, all work together towards making transparency measures comprehensive and more effective. Morocco would like to inscribe itself as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.48, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”.

We support the call to take action today on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, entitled “The arms trade treaty”. Morocco supports the continuation of negotiations on an arms trade treaty in a transparent and inclusive manner. In that regard, we welcome the

convening of a conference in 2013. We urge the earliest possible nomination of a president of the conference and the launching of intensive consultations prior to the conference. It is crucial to make best use of the time prior or ahead of the conference, as the time available to the conference itself will be very limited. We reiterate again that consensus, from our point of view, is an effective tool as long as it is not abused and interpreted as meaning unanimity or veto power.

**Mr. Wensley** (South Africa): I take the floor to make a general statement on behalf of the authors — Colombia, Japan and South Africa — of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.48, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”.

Since the introduction of the draft resolution on 18 October, a number of further informal consultations have been conducted. It is the sense of the authors that there is broad support for the revision that is reflected in the revised draft of the new, fourth preambular paragraph, which I will read out now.

“Mindful of the implementation of the outcomes adopted by the follow-up meetings of the Programme of Action”.

The new text was posted on the QuickFirst website on Monday, and my delegation also circulated it to all delegations on that evening. It is the hope of the authors that the draft resolution can be adopted by consensus.

**Mr. Adejola** (Nigeria): The delegation of Nigeria would like to place on record the following remarks with respect to cluster 4. We could not share the inner recesses of our thoughts within the wisely crafted one minute of speaking informally on that cluster — a constraint, of course, occasioned by the unfortunate disruptions of Hurricane Sandy. Our thoughts remain with all those who lost loved ones and properties and sources of livelihood.

One of the objectives of the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty, held in July, was the need to create an enabling environment for the transfer of all conventional weapons involving States and authorized non-State actors. It also sought to minimize the harm caused by such weapons across the globe and to ensure that oversight mechanisms were created for their safe delivery to intended end users. The legitimate concern of the international community quite rightly was aimed at addressing the fear and apprehension about conventional arms and ammunitions

being arbitrarily transferred to unauthorized non-State actors and end users.

It is not an exaggeration when we say that conventional weapons, especially small arms and light weapons, are the weapons of mass destruction in our region. We must therefore deal with that subject with all the seriousness it deserves. It is in this light that Nigeria has signed on as a sponsor and will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, entitled “The arms trade treaty”, under agenda item 94 (b). We hope, notwithstanding what we consider to be ambiguities in the paper of 26 July on the scope and aspects of the diversion of weapons, that we can still move ahead, that those and other issues will be addressed to ensure closure, and that we can finish our remaining work in March 2013, when we hope to have a robust arms trade treaty that strongly contributes to global peace and security.

Our concern on the issue is borne out by the reality we face constantly. Terrorism today, in its many forms, is fueled essentially by easy and uncontrolled access to conventional weapons and explosives for making bombs. As we are faced with numerous security challenges in the Sahel region and our various States, we cannot afford to lower our guard when it comes to monitoring and prohibiting all illicit arms shipments, transfers and movements.

To demonstrate that point, a foreign national not from Africa was apprehended in a State member of the Economic Community of West African States for organizing the illegal shipment of 80,000 assault rifles, other types of rifles and pistols, and more than 32 million rounds of ammunition intended for shipment to my country, Nigeria. That was one of the anomalies Member States sought to correct in July 2012 and one which we have signed on to in order to productively engage other delegations to address in March 2013. We commend the efforts of the Chair, the authors and sponsors, and assure all Member States of Nigeria’s support for a regulated trade in conventional arms.

**Mr. Van den IJsell** (Netherlands): I take the floor to speak on draft decision A/C.1/67/L.22, entitled “Transparency in armaments”. We are a firm believer in the importance of transparency in the field of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation. Since its birth in the General Assembly in 1991, we have taken the lead in submitting the relevant resolutions on the Register on Conventional Arms to the United Nations membership. One of the important features of the Register is that a regular review is undertaken

by a group of governmental experts convened by the Secretary-General.

In conformity with paragraph 5 (b) of resolution 66/39, adopted at last year’s session of the General Assembly, a new round of meetings of the group was scheduled to start in the second half of 2012. When we suggested those days a year ago, we expected and hoped that by that time we would have a positive outcome of the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty, and that the next group of governmental experts could reflect upon the consequences of an arms trade treaty (ATT) for the Register. Unfortunately, as we all know, there was no outcome of the July Conference, and we will have to wait a little longer before we know what the provisions of the ATT and hence its possible consequences for the Register will be.

For that reason, we have submitted to the First Committee a draft decision contained in document A/C.1/67/L.22 to postpone the start of the cycle of meetings of the group of governmental experts on the Register to 2013. We have been informed that this suggested postponement of the group’s work to April to July 2013 would still fall within the present United Nations budgetary biennium, which means that there will be no additional costs. We therefore hope that the Committee can adopt the draft decision by consensus.

**Mr. Langeland** (Norway): Norway supports draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, entitled “The arms trade treaty”. During the consultations, my delegation presented its views on a number of issues related to the draft resolution, including the issue of the rules of procedure. My delegation considers the draft text to be a solid package, and we will support it. We also encourage other Member States to support the draft resolution.

Lastly, Norway welcomes the outcome of the Second Review Conference on the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. We share the hope that draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.48 will be adopted by consensus.

**Mr. Rowe** (Sierra Leone): Due to some communication problems not attributable to Hurricane Sandy, Sierra Leone is not listed among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.48, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”. We have traditionally and for obvious reasons always co-sponsored the draft resolution on the illicit trade

in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects, and we would like to be added to the list of sponsors of A/C.1/67/L.48.

**The Chair:** I now call on delegations wishing to take the floor in explanation of vote before the voting.

**Mr. Hallak** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft decision A/C.1/67/L.22, entitled “Transparency in armaments”.

The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic fully supports the global trend towards the establishment of an international community that does not use or threaten to use force, and that is guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, based on justice, equality and peace. We stress that we stand ready to back any sincere international effort to carry out those objectives.

We call attention to draft decision A/C.1/67/L.22 and to all draft resolutions proposed previously to the First Committee under the same agenda item. Those draft resolutions do not take into account the specific situation in the Middle East, where the Arab-Israeli conflict dominates our attention, given Israel’s occupation of Arab territories and its refusal to implement relevant Security Council resolutions. Israel continues to be armed by powerful countries that provide it with various types of weapons of mass destruction and advanced, deadly conventional weapons. Israel continues to produce different front-line weapons, including nuclear weapons, and to stockpile them locally. That is why we shall again abstain in the voting on the draft decision in question.

**Mr. Cassidy** (Indonesia): Indonesia would like explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, entitled “The arms trade treaty”. Indonesia supports the establishment of an arms trade treaty (ATT) that is strong and balanced, incorporating the interests of both exporting and importing countries. The judgement of the application of human rights in arms transfers should not solely be defined by exporting States.

While we will support the continuation of the process of the ATT, we will abstain in the voting on paragraphs 2 and 3, as the positions of Indonesia, which are supported by an overwhelming majority of countries, are not yet reflected in the draft text of the ATT submitted by the President of the United Nations Conference on the ATT on 26 July. Specifically, the draft text unfortunately fails to clearly state the

legitimate rights of every State in the possible situation of intra-State conflict. It will be very difficult for the Government and the Parliament of Indonesia to ratify such a draft and a future ATT absent the inclusion of the principle of territorial integrity.

Finally, it remains our hope that the next United Nations Conference on the ATT in March 2013 will be conducted in a genuinely transparent manner and in a way that maximizes the possibility for compromise.

**Mr. Pintado** (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I take the floor in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, entitled “The arms trade treaty”.

Mexico attaches the utmost importance to negotiations on an international, legally binding and solid treaty that will establish regulations for the trade in conventional weapons, including small arms and light weapons, and ensure that these arms and their ammunitions are not used or diverted in order to perpetrate serious violations of international humanitarian law or human rights or diverted to the illicit market or to transnational organized crime.

My delegation, like all other delegations present here, worked assiduously during the Diplomatic Conference that took place in July in order to agree on this treaty. Although we were unfortunately unable to adopt the treaty, Mexico remains convinced of the need to reach and possibility of reaching agreement. We must collectively commit ourselves to making the efforts necessary to reach an agreement that is acceptable to all. However, that willingness to reach consensus cannot be interpreted as the right of one or a few delegations to impede a general agreement. We believe that we will always have before us the options for action established by the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

We understand that draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, “The arms trade treaty”, lays the necessary foundation in order to resume negotiations as soon as possible and to conclude them in 2013. That is why Mexico will vote in favour of the draft resolution and hopes that it will receive the strong support of delegations.

**Ms. Allain** (Canada): Canada takes the floor to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.48, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”. Canada will join the consensus on the draft resolution, as we believe that the goal of impeding illicit flows of small arms and light

weapons used in terrorism, organized crime and armed conflict is an important one.

While acting on the need to hinder the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, it is important that we recognize and acknowledge the legitimacy of lawful ownership of, and trade in, firearms by responsible citizens for their personal and recreational use, including sport shooting, hunting and collecting. We must not forget that, since there are legitimate uses, there is also legitimate trade.

The Government of Canada is strongly committed to keeping its communities and streets safe. Canada has also taken steps to lessen the burden on law-abiding gun owners by eliminating a wasteful and ineffective long-gun registry. We stress that any United Nations initiatives designed to address the illicit trade in small arms should in no way result in any new burdens being placed on lawful firearms owners in Canada.

**Mr. Ovsyanko** (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): Belarus would like to make an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, entitled “The arms trade treaty”.

The Republic of Belarus welcomes the initiative to hold a new conference on the arms trade treaty with the objective of reaching a United Nations-led consensus document aimed at improving international standards with respect to the trade of conventional weapons and resolving problems related to the uncontrolled and illegal spread of conventional weapons. At the same time, the delegation of Belarus cannot support a document that would prejudice the results of the work of this important endeavour, especially taking into account the significant disagreement on the arms trade treaty that arose at this year’s United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty.

However, the delegation of Belarus stands ready to constructively cooperate during the negotiations process with all Member States.

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Cherniavsky** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, entitled “The arms trade treaty”, was introduced under agenda item 94 (b) by the representative of Costa Rica on behalf of several sponsors at the 14th meeting, on 23 October. The

sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.11 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.4. The draft resolution is accompanied by a statement on the programme budget implications that has been issued as a separate document under symbol A/C.1/67/L.60.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 2 and 3. I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 2.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia

*Against:*

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

*Abstaining:*

Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Kuwait, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zimbabwe

*Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 153 votes to 1, with 18 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 3.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain

and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia

*Against:*

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

*Abstaining:*

Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Kuwait, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zimbabwe

*Operative paragraph 3 was retained by 148 votes to 1, with 22 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, as a whole.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, 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, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia,

Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Abstaining:*

Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen

*Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, as a whole, was adopted by 157 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/67/L.22.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Cherniavsky** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/67/L.22, entitled “Transparency in armaments”, was introduced under agenda item 94 by the representative of the Netherlands at the Committee’s 15th meeting, on 24 October. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/67/L.22.

Draft decision A/C.1/67/L.22, entitled “Transparency in armaments”, is accompanied by an oral statement by the Secretary-General, which, with the Chair’s permission, I will now read out. The oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of draft decision A/C.1/67/L.22, the General Assembly would decide to request the Secretary-General to convene the group of governmental experts mentioned in paragraph 5 (b) of resolution 66/39 in 2013, without change to the other modalities for the group as elaborated in that paragraph.

At its sixty-fourth session, the General Assembly adopted 64/54, entitled “Transparency in armaments”. Under paragraph 6 (d) of that resolution, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, with a view to the three-year review cycle of the Register, to ensure that sufficient resources were made available for a group of governmental experts to be convened in 2012

to review the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the views expressed by Member States and the reports of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development.

At its sixty-sixth session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 66/39, entitled “Transparency in armaments”. Under paragraph 5 (b) of that resolution, the General Assembly the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be convened in 2012, within available resources and on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the views expressed by Member States and the reports of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, with a view to taking a decision at its sixty-eighth session.

Pursuant to the request indicated above, it was envisaged that the group of governmental experts would hold three sessions — one session in Geneva in 2012 and two sessions in New York in 2013. The conference servicing and non-conference servicing required for these three sessions of the group of governmental experts have been included in the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council and conference management”; section 4, “Disarmament”; and section 28 (d), “Office of Central Support Services”.

It should be noted, however, that the group of governmental experts did not meet in 2012 as originally envisaged. Pursuant to draft decision A/C.1/67/L.22, the modalities for the group remain unchanged. That is, it is still expected to report to the General Assembly at its sixty-eighth session; hence, its three sessions — one in Geneva and two in New York — shall be held in 2013. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft decision A/C.1/67/L.22, no additional financial requirements would arise under the programme budget for the 2012-2013.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990 and subsequent resolutions, the most recent of which was resolution 66/246 of 24 December 2011, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate main committee of the General Assembly

entrusted with responsibility for administrative and budgetary measures and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bahrain, Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Draft decision A/C.1/67/L.22 was adopted by 149 votes to none, with 26 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.48.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee

**Mr. Cherniavsky** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.48, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects", was introduced under agenda item 94 (bb) by the representative of South Africa, also on behalf of Colombia and Japan, at the 16th meeting, on 25 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.48 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.4. In addition, Morocco has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.48.

At this meeting, the representative of South Africa introduced an oral revision to the draft resolution by which the fourth preambular paragraph now reads:

"Mindful of the implementation of the outcomes adopted by the follow-up meetings of the programme of action".

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.48 is accompanied by an oral statement by the Secretary-General, which I will read out with the Chair's permission. The oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of operative paragraphs 5 and 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.48, the General Assembly would decide, pursuant to the schedule of meetings for the period from 2012 to 2018 agreed at the Second United Nations Review Conference, to convene, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Programme of Action, a one-week biennial meeting of States in New York in 2014 and 2016 and a one-week open-ended meeting of governmental experts in 2015 to consider the full and effective implementation of the Programme of Action. The General Assembly would also decide, in accordance with the decision of the Second United Nations Review Conference, to hold the

Third United Nations Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects in 2018 for a period of two weeks, preceded by a one-week preparatory committee meeting early in 2018.

Pursuant to operative paragraph 5, it is envisaged that a one-week biennial meeting of States would be held in New York in 2014 and that a one-week open-ended meeting of governmental experts would be held in 2015. Another one-week biennial meeting of States would be held in New York in 2016. Pursuant to operative paragraph 6, a two-week session of the Third United Nations Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects would be held in New York in 2018, preceded by a one-week preparatory committee meeting early in 2018.

The conference services requirements for a biennial meeting of States in 2014 are estimated to be \$291,000 at the current rate, and for an open-ended meeting of meeting of governmental experts in 2015 to be \$291,000 at the current rate. These meetings would constitute an additional resource requirement for the biennium 2014-2015. Furthermore, at this stage the Secretariat is not in a position to provide reliable estimates for the resource requirement in respect of the biennial meeting of States in 2016. The Third Review Conference in 2018 or its preparatory committee meeting in early 2018. These requirements will be considered in the context of a proposed programme budget for the bienniums 2016-2017 and 2018-2019.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.48, additional resources in the amount of \$582,000 would be required under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015, under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management". This would require an additional appropriation of \$582,000 to be included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015. Furthermore, the related financial implications for the period 2016-2018 will be considered in the context of the preparation of the programme budget for the bienniums 2016-2017 and 2018-2019.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B, 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 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 draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.48 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote, as orally revised.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.48, as orally revised, was adopted.*

**The Chair:** I shall now give the floor to delegations that wish to take the floor in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions just adopted. I encourage delegations, in view of the time, to kindly shorten their interventions to a reasonable time. They can also state very clearly that they wish to have the long and complete statements posted on the QuickFirst web portal.

**Mr. Hassan** (Sudan): I would like to make the following statement on behalf of the members of the League of Arab States with regard to draft decision A/C.1/66/L.22, on transparency in armaments.

The States members of the League of Arab States would like to reaffirm their position with regard to transparency in armaments, especially with regard to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. For years, the States members of the Arab League have expressed their opinions with regard to transparency in armaments. We adhere to the Register of Conventional Arms. Our opinions are firm, clear and based on general perspectives with regard to disarmament, as well as on the specific nature of the situation in the Middle East.

We support transparency in armaments as a means to enhance international peace and security. We also believe that if any transparency machinery is to be successful, we must follow certain essential guidelines that should be balanced, transparent and non-discriminatory. In addition, they must enhance the security of all countries at the national, regional and international levels, in accordance with international law.

The Register is the first attempt of the international community to address the issue of transparency at the international level. Although we cannot question the credibility of the Register as a confidence-building mechanism, it faces a number of problems, the most

significant of which is the fact that half the Member States refrain from providing the Register with relevant information. Moreover, the States members of the League of Arab States would like to expand the scope of the Register, in particular because experience over the past few years has shown that it is limited to seven types of conventional weapons and is not carried out at the international level.

The States members of the League of Arab States believe that the Register does not fulfil their security needs because of its limited scope. Therefore, in the future it will be up to the Member States to build confidence in the Register itself in order to achieve more transparency.

By virtue of resolution 46/36 L, we believe that the scope of the Register needs to be expanded to include, in particular, advanced conventional weapons and advanced technology with military applications. That would make it more comprehensive and balanced and less discriminatory and would lead to more involvement by a larger number of participants.

The Middle East is a special region in that regard, which shows that there is no qualitative balance when it comes to weapons. For that reason, confidence and transparency can be achieved only in a comprehensive and balanced manner. Restricting this measure to seven types of weapons and neglecting the more advanced and destructive ones, such as weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, is unbalanced and incomprehensive and will not achieve the desired results.

Above all, we must bear in mind the situation in the Middle East and Israel's occupation and possession of the most lethal weapons. Moreover, Israel is the only State in the region that is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Yet it insists on ignoring the repeated calls of the international community that it adhere to the NPT and subject its nuclear facilities to the comprehensive safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Israel continues to accumulate a very advanced arsenal of weapons of mass destruction and nuclear weapons, which keeps its qualitative military advantage compared to all its neighbours combined. That undoubtedly undermines the credibility of the international oversight and transparency mechanisms. Transparency measures need to cover all types of weapons, including weapons of mass destruction, in

particular nuclear weapons, in order to be comprehensive and effective.

For all the aforementioned reasons, the States members of the League of Arab States abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

**Mr. Aljowaily** (Egypt): I would first of all like to associate my delegation with the statement just made by the representative of the Sudan, on behalf of the League of Arab States, with regard to draft decision A/C.1/67/L.22.

Separately, I would like to present an explanation of Egypt's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11 in my national capacity. Egypt abstained in the voting on the draft resolution, entitled "The arms trade treaty".

Egypt believes that the First Committee deliberations should have resulted in a procedural decision, allowing for the continued negotiations of a balanced arms trade treaty. However, the draft resolution went beyond the simple task that was intended. It set parameters that would affect the substantive work before us. In particular, paragraph 3 of the draft resolution decides

"that the draft text of the Arms Trade Treaty submitted by the President of the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty on 26 July 2012 ... shall be the basis for future work on the Arms Trade Treaty".

Egypt considers the draft text of the Arms Trade Treaty submitted on 26 July as an attempt by the President of the Conference to consolidate the different papers that were discussed in the preceding weeks. However, it became almost immediately evident that major arms exporters could not at the time adhere to it. At the same time, the 26 July text also fell short of including proposals by other participating States, including Egypt. We had expected the text to adequately address our major concern of elaborating a genuinely multilateral legal instrument of international law and international humanitarian law by subjecting the criteria and implementation of the proposed treaty to multilateral benchmarks, including all the Geneva Conventions, and by addressing the issue of foreign occupation, in addition to a dispute settlement mechanism and recourse to appeals for denials of transfers.

The 26 July draft was more of a work in progress. Now that there is more time, it could be one of the bases on which the negotiations now proceed. The

text, alongside the various contributions of the different countries, can now provide ample material for substantive improvement. In that context and with that spirit, we decided to limit our position to abstaining in the voting on paragraph 3, given the assurance of the right of delegations to put forward additional proposals on that text and in the light that the President-designate will undertake consultations on its basis, the results of which are expected to be presented before or at the beginning of the March Conference.

The potential Treaty should be universal. The negotiations should be truly inclusive. We believe that the Conference would not be genuinely multilateral unless all States Members of the United Nations and/or specialized agencies participate on an equal footing and are heard with equal attention. The current draft text of the resolution also fails to give that assurance. Furthermore, as the objective is to negotiate a treaty that is adopted by consensus, Egypt does not see the need to put any artificial deadline on the process of the negotiations.

Egypt looks forward to capitalizing on the progress achieved so far in order to reach a balanced outcome. Such an outcome would be an arms trade treaty that would have a real impact on curtailing the illicit trade in arms. It would be a treaty that would promote further respect for the applicable international law, in full and not in part, in a comprehensive manner and not through selectivity.

**Mr. Najafi** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation regarding the draft resolution entitled “The arms trade treaty”, contained in document A/C.1/67/L.11.

We voted against paragraph 2 of the draft resolution since it merely indicates the “elaboration”, not the “negotiation”, of the arms trade treaty (ATT) as the mandate of the final United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty Conference, due to be held in March 2013 to negotiate the Treaty as an international legally binding instrument.

That paragraph can be used as a pretext to avoid real negotiations during the Conference, as was the case at the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty in July. While recalling all efforts made during the Conference to avoid real negotiations and to put delegations under extreme pressure, including through disrespectful behaviour, such as holding consultations in a very uncomfortable situation in a corner of the

United Nations, we stress that, as such practices were counterproductive in the past, their continuation in the upcoming Conference will also be a futile exercise.

Indeed, the resumed session of the Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty will be a success only if all proposals are accorded equal importance, the security concerns and interests of all States are duly taken into account, decisions on all issues are made by consensus, and, above all, delegations are fully respected and allowed to conduct real negotiations.

As a country that has constructively participated in the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty and its preparatory meetings, we stress once again that such a process should not be aimed at pursuing narrow national agendas or regional policies.

We also voted against paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, which decides that the paper submitted by the President of the July Conference (A/CONF.217/CRP.1) shall be the basis for future work on the Arms Trade Treaty. As the President of that Conference himself clearly said, that paper was prepared under his own responsibility and without prejudice to the position of Member States. Therefore, it is not the product of negotiations that shall be the basis for the negotiations in the upcoming Conference.

The paper is very vague, confusing and full of loopholes. For instance, the parameters proposed in the paper are extremely subjective, open to different interpretations and therefore highly susceptible to abuse. Those parameters explicitly allow arms-exporting States to export as many arms as they wish to any country or region, if in their view alone, such exports could contribute to peace and security, despite the fact that the excessive accumulation of conventional arms in certain sensitive and volatile regions of the world — including in our own region, the Persian Gulf and the Middle East — is the direct result of such wrong assumptions of arms-exporting countries,

It is regrettable that the President’s paper seeks to legalize and legitimize such dangerous practices. Taking into account the bitter fact that the stability and security of many regions are placed in extreme danger by the so-called commercial interests of arms-exporting countries, to our surprise the President’s paper gives prominence to such commercial interests and completely neglects the security concerns and interests of other countries and regions.

A possible ATT should serve as a tool for promoting peace, security and stability in different countries and regions, not as an instrument to ensure the commercial interests of major arms-exporting countries that in many cases are illegitimate. While a potential ATT is expected to clearly prohibit the transfer of conventional arms to aggressors and foreign occupiers, unbelievably and surprisingly the reference to “commit or aggravate an act of aggression or foreign occupation” as a criterion for preventing and prohibiting the transfer of such arms to aggressors and occupying forces, has been deleted from the current version of that paper. Worse still, according to the paper, the treaty shall “not apply to the international transfer of conventional arms” by States outside their territories, while in many cases in the past, including in our region of the Middle East, such transferred arms have been used to commit the acts of aggression.

Moreover, the President’s paper does not encompass any reference to the most relevant principle — the inalienable right of all peoples under foreign occupation to self-determination and to take legitimate actions to realize that inherent right. These disappointing elements have emerged simply because of the opposition of a certain country that is a staunch ally and major patron of an occupying regime. Such essential international principles were disregarded merely to reward aggressors and appease and satisfy foreign occupiers, while a possible ATT is highly expected to be a strong tool in preventing aggression, deterring foreign occupation and discouraging the invasion of other countries.

These and other points disqualify the paper of the President of the Conference from serving as the basis for negotiations of a possible arms trade treaty. In our view, along with the compilation of the concrete proposals of the Member States, the President’s paper should be considered as only one of several documents at the upcoming conference and not the sole basis for that conference’s work. In that connection, we would like to underscore the right of delegations to put forward any proposal during the upcoming ATT conference.

**Mr. Proaño** (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): Ecuador voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11 as a whole as a demonstration of its commitment to the process initiated by resolution 64/48. Ecuador believes that an arms trade treaty could contribute both to the fight against the diversion of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons, ammunition and

explosives towards the illicit market and to the cause of transparency in armaments weapons.

However, my delegation must point out its concern regarding a number of aspects of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11. For example, under paragraph 2, the General Assembly would decide to utilize the same modalities under which the July 2012 Conference operated. In that regard, my delegation hopes that at the upcoming conference we will be able to move on once and for all to holding direct negotiations among States.

Likewise, my delegation abstained in the voting on paragraph 3 in the belief that the 26 July document (A/CONF.217/CRP.1) does not faithfully reflect the position of all States, but represents only an interpretation by the President of the Conference of those positions — an exercise akin to the process seen during the meetings of the Preparatory Committee that preceded the July Conference. Therefore, the 26 July document is not the product of a genuine process of direct negotiations among States. This factor could have been remedied by the inclusion of the opinions put forward by States at the July 2012 Conference as a further basis for negotiations.

My delegation hopes that further negotiations on an arms trade treaty will take into account, in a transparent and equitable way, the points of view of all States, bearing particularly in mind that the approaches — and hence the concerns — of States on this topic are by their very nature quite different when it comes to importer and exporter States, especially in terms of defence and security. Defence and security considerations must be discussed and negotiated in the light of Articles 2 and 51 of the Charter of the United Nations with a view to avoiding any potential political misuse that could derive from such a treaty.

**Mrs. Parkar** (India): India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, on the arms trade treaty. We believe that further work needs to be done, and that a treaty of this kind, which would be legally binding when in force, should not be rushed through. Such a treaty should make a real impact on addressing illicit trafficking in conventional arms and their diversion to terrorists and other non-State actors. It should establish a balance between the obligations of exporting and importing States, and ensure that national implementation and domestic jurisdiction are fully respected. It is important to bring all stakeholders on board in a manner that promotes the prospects of

a treaty that is practical, implementable and able to attract universal adherence. India is prepared to engage in further work on such a treaty in a consensus-based process and outcome, without imposing artificial deadlines.

**Mrs. Ledesma Hernández** (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, entitled “The arms trade treaty”.

In July, the international community witnessed the lack of consensus at the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty. Related developments have shown that there can be no place for hasty or forced decisions.

The issue of the transfer of conventional weapons is complex. Its significant political, economic, legal and security implications for all States cannot be underestimated. We supported paragraph 2 of the draft resolution on the understanding that Cuba has noted that future discussions on this important item will be followed up. We are convinced that the true success of that process will be the achievement of an instrument as the outcome of an inclusive and transparent process that takes due account of the will and concerns of all States and is acceptable to all delegations. That is the only way to achieve a sound, universal and, as a result, effective treaty.

Such an instrument must contain general standards so that all countries can properly undertake the import, export and transfer of conventional weapons without affecting their national security interests or the legitimate rights of States to manufacture, import and possess small weapons and light arms in order to meet their legitimate security and defence needs, pursuant to Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Our delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and on paragraph 3. We believe that the draft resolution should have been based more on facts and more objective. It should have reflected what truly took place at the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty in July 2012. We also think that it should have taken due account of the amendments that delegations had submitted to the draft resolution. The draft resolution should have called for not only finalizing the elaboration of the future treaty but also inclusive and transparent negotiations on the basis of consensus in the new phase of work.

In paragraph 3, the draft resolution underscores the President’s draft text of 26 July (A/CONF.217/CRP.1) as the basis for future work, intentionally disregarding the fact that the proposals submitted by delegations throughout the process are a further basis for such work. Allow us to be frank. The draft text of the President of 26 July did not receive consensus at the diplomatic conference. Rather, it was the cause of the failure. For that reason, it will be important to jointly take up the proposals considered in the course of the conference on various elements of the future treaty, submitted by delegations, including Cuba.

We believe that conditions for the transfer of weapons that contravene the principles of the Charter of the United Nations or that can be politically manipulated have no place in the future arms trade treaty. We hope that the reference in the draft text to utilizing, *mutatis mutandis*, the modalities applied in the Conference does not imply resorting to the same methods and programme of work that prevented the success of the previous conference. We believe that it is important for the future work of the second conference to be guided by the same agreed rules of procedure that provide for the adoption of the future arms trade treaty by consensus. In that regard, we hope that the wording used in paragraph 6 does not breach that principle of consensus.

In conclusion, we wish to underscore that the proposals on elements of a future treaty must reflect achievable goals that do not divert us from the objective of strengthening mechanisms to prevent and combat illicit arms trafficking.

**Mr. Toro-Carnevali** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to take the floor to explain my delegation’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, entitled “The arms trade treaty”.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela supports an inclusive and non-discriminatory negotiations process of an international instrument to regulate the trade of conventional weapons. The draft resolution before us today on that issue, however, restricts the negotiations to only one document, the draft treaty submitted by the President of the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty in July 2012. That decision prejudices the outcome of the meeting on the issue to be held in 2013.

By removing the possibility of considering other proposals, the draft resolution makes the negotiating process less inclusive. Moreover, by limiting the

negotiations to the draft text of the President of the Conference, the draft resolution before us today endorses a specific and substantive view of what we want the next or this future arms trade treaty to be. In that way, it has abandoned the procedural character that it could have had.

For those reasons, my delegation decided to abstain in today's voting on the draft resolution.

**Ms. Chatt** (Canada): I will be brief. Canada takes the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, entitled "The arms trade treaty".

Canada believes that the goal of impeding the illicit and irresponsible arms trade that fuels terrorism, organized crime and armed conflict is important. While acting on the need to hinder the irresponsible trade in conventional arms and their diversion to illicit end-users or end-uses, it is also very important that an arms trade treaty recognize and acknowledge the legitimacy of the lawful ownership of and trade in firearms by responsible citizens for their personal and recreational use, including sports shooting, hunting and collecting.

We must not forget that, since there are legitimate uses, there is also a legitimate trade. Canada firmly believes that it is important for that to be recognized in an arms trade treaty in order to focus and strengthen the treaty by clarifying its intent. As such, during the arms trade treaty negotiations, Canada advocated for a preambular paragraph in the treaty text on the legitimacy of the lawful ownership of and trade in certain conventional arms. Canada wishes to see that paragraph in the draft treaty text strengthened so that the treaty does not simply take note of but rather affirms the legitimacy of those activities.

Furthermore, we stress that an arms trade treaty should in no way result in any new burdens being placed on lawful firearms owners in Canada.

**Mr. Hallak** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): We will read out part of our explanation of vote and request the Secretariat to include the full explanation of vote in the verbatim records of the First Committee and on its website.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11, entitled "The arms trade treaty", we would at the outset like to state that any measures on the transparent regulation of weapons through a selective approach will not be inclusive and will prevent the international community's commitment to general and complete

disarmament. The draft resolution just adopted, in particular in paragraphs 2 and 3, refers to the adoption of the draft text submitted by the President of the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty on 26 July 2012 as the basis for the negotiations (see A/CONF.217/CRP.1). That text is not the outcome of negotiations among the States participating in the Conference. Rather, it expresses the viewpoint of the President and was submitted in his personal capacity as the outcome of bilateral and informal consultations held in very strange circumstances.

Negotiations on any treaty are always characterized by transparency. Yet that principle was not respected at the July Conference. The draft text of the President did not reflect the relevant proposals submitted by numerous delegations. It contained only the views of some States. The participants in the consultations well know what I am saying. We are talking about a legally binding treaty that should be agreed by consensus and comply with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. It should not be a means of political and economic manipulation and a justification for interference in the internal affairs of States.

Regrettably, the draft text of the President did not follow that process. We are therefore surprised that the draft resolution refers to the draft text of the President as the basis for the negotiations. It is also strange to adopt the modalities of the previous Conference as the rules of procedure for the upcoming conference.

Any future arms trade treaty should be considered by participants in a transparent and inclusive way. It should contain the following elements: the inherent right of States, pursuant to the Charter of the United Nations, in particular Article 51, to the acquisition of all necessary means to protect their national security and in the exercise of self-defence; the prohibition of the transfer of weapons to States that occupy the territory of another State; the right of peoples under foreign occupation to self-defence and self-determination; the territorial integrity of States; non-interference in the internal affairs of States; and the prohibition of the transfer of equipment and materials to terrorists, non-State actors and mercenaries.

**Mr. Hashmi** (Pakistan): In brief, Pakistan shares the humanitarian concerns that may arise from the misuse of conventional weapons, particularly small arms and light weapons. My explanation of vote pertains to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.11.

We recognize that the authors of the draft resolution took into account some, if not most, proposals. In our view, the primary purpose of the draft text should have been to provide an organizational and procedural framework for the forthcoming diplomatic conference on the arms trade treaty. However, we share the concern that the draft resolution has retained certain elements that may impinge upon the substance or prejudice the outcome of the conference. We would have preferred a process-related draft resolution.

Pakistan nevertheless voted in favour of the draft resolution on the basis of the following understanding. First, the draft resolution is essentially meant to identify the organizational and procedural road map for the forthcoming diplomatic conference. Secondly, in accordance with the established practice of intergovernmental negotiations, the views and proposals of all Member States take precedence over any other paper or document. Thirdly, the draft text of the President of the July 2012 United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty does not represent the views and proposals of all Member States. It can therefore constitute one of the inputs and can be construed as a basis, not the basis. The final text of the treaty shall be adopted by consensus, as provided for in the Conference rules of procedure and resolution 64/48.

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to consider cluster 5, “Other disarmament matters and international security”.

I give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.24.

**Mr. Shin Dong Ik** (Republic of Korea): I would briefly like to introduce, under cluster 5, draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.24, entitled “Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities”, co-authored by the Republic of Korea and Australia.

The draft resolution focuses on international efforts to prevent and combat illicit brokering activities as an important means to effectively address the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and illicit transfers of conventional weapons. The draft resolution proposes that States establish appropriate national laws and encourages them to implement relevant international obligations. It also emphasizes the importance of capacity-building and international cooperation and assistance and of strengthening efforts towards those ends.

The draft text of this year’s draft resolution has been updated on the basis of the previous resolution 65/75 to reflect recent relevant developments and to encourage Member States to take appropriate measures for international cooperation and assistance.

I wish to draw the attention of delegations to the revisions submitted to the Secretariat and posted on QuickFirst, through which we have sought to address certain concerns raised by some members.

First, in the fifth preambular paragraph, we have added the phrase “materials related to” in front of the phrase “nuclear, chemical or biological weapons and their means of delivery” in order to more accurately reflect the relevant paragraph in Security Council resolution 1540 (2004).

Secondly, in the twelfth preambular paragraph, we have deleted the phrase “including those elaborated at the 2012 Seoul Nuclear Security Summit”. We have added a new preambular paragraph following that preambular paragraph, which reads: “Noting the holding of the Nuclear Security Summit on 26 and 27 March 2012 in Seoul”. That reflects similar language to that of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.26, which was adopted without a vote on 2 November.

My delegation seeks the continued support of all Member States for this draft resolution.

**The Chair:** I give the floor to the representative of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

**Mr. Kang Myong Chol** (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea): My delegation intends to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.24, entitled “Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities”. We believe that the sponsor of the draft resolution has the ulterior motive of legitimizing the illicit activities of some countries, especially the United States, with regard to arbitrary interception. That activity is not consistent with existing international law and seeks to violate the sovereignty of countries by abusing and restricting their freedom of passage on the high seas. It is a very dangerous attempt, which could have drastic consequences. South Korea, by sponsoring the draft resolution, has once again revealed its identity as a subordinate of the United States. My delegation rejects draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.24.

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.24.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Cherniavsky** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.24, entitled “Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities”, was introduced, under agenda item 94 (n), by the representative of the Republic of Korea at this meeting. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.24 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.4.

The representative of the Republic of Korea has just introduced an oral revision to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.24 as follows. In the fifth preambular paragraph, the words “material related to” were added before the words “nuclear, chemical or biological weapons and their means of delivery”. In addition, the twelfth preambular paragraph was edited. The words “including those elaborated at the 2012 Seoul Nuclear Security Summit” were deleted, and a new twelfth preambular paragraph (bis) was added, which reads “Noting the holding of the Nuclear Security Summit on 26 and 27 March 2012 in Seoul”.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the twelfth preambular paragraph and the new twelfth preambular paragraph (bis).

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, 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, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen

*Against:*

Democratic People’s Republic of Korea

*Abstaining:*

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Syrian Arab Republic, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*The twelfth preambular paragraph was retained by 167 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now take action on the twelfth preambular paragraph (bis).

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, 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, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen

*Against:*

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

*Abstaining:*

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

*The twelfth preambular paragraph (bis) was retained by 167 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.24 as a whole, as orally revised.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), 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, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia,

Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, 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, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, 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, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, 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, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen

*Against:*

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

*Abstaining:*

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.24, as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted by 174 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** I now give the floor to representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

**Mr. Najafi** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation regarding draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.24, entitled "Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities", as orally revised.

Since there is a licit as well as an illicit trade and brokering in small arms and light weapons, Member States addressed both issues within the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, and while recognizing the legal trade and brokering in small arms and light weapons, committed themselves to preventing, combating and eradicating the illicit trade and brokering in such weapons.

However, the notion of illicit brokering in weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), which is wrongly reflected in the draft resolution, implies that there is a licit trade and brokering in WMDs, whereas all of us well know that under major international conventions on weapons of mass destruction — namely, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Biological Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention — the production, development, research, transfer and use of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons are prohibited. Consequently, any trade or brokering in WMDs is inherently illegal.

Accordingly, the only possible interpretation of some paragraphs contained in the draft resolution would be that the trade and brokering in WMDs or their transfer from a possessor State to non-possessor States are legal, which is, for instance, in full contravention of article I of the NPT, according to which

“Each nuclear-weapon State Party to the Treaty undertakes not to transfer to any recipient whatsoever nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly; and not in any way to assist, encourage, or induce any non-nuclear-weapon State to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, or control over such weapons or explosive devices.”

Therefore, it is clear that any transfer of or trade and brokering in nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices is illegal, which is the case also with respect to other weapons of mass destruction.

We share the view of the draft resolution’s sponsor on the need to prevent and combat the illicit brokering in small arms and light weapons and the importance of preventing terrorist groups from having access to WMDs, which are valid concerns that have already been addressed by the Committee through the adoption of other draft resolutions. However, we are of the

view that the illicit trade and brokering in WMDs and illicit brokering in small arms and light weapons are two distinct phenomena, and that while there is a licit role for small arms and light weapons, there is none for weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, legally, logically and methodologically, it is inappropriate to mix these two completely different issues.

While we fully agree that there is a need to prevent and combat the illicit trade and brokering in small arms and light weapons, we believe that its extension to the domain of weapons of mass destruction is not acceptable and that, legally speaking, it is incorrect. Although urging the international community to prevent and combat the illicit trade and brokering in WMDs seems at first glance to be a great idea, one should also take into account its legal consequences — that is, accepting the legality of trade and brokering in WMDs. Therefore, the adoption of the draft resolution in its current form may lead to an interpretation that is detrimental to the letter and spirit of major international conventions on WMDs.

Moreover, one part of the draft resolution recognizes, albeit implicitly, non-transparent and exclusive export control regimes, such as the Australia Group, that were not negotiated or agreed within the United Nations and only serve the political objectives of certain States by hampering international cooperation in science and technology for peaceful purposes.

For the reasons I have just stated, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution and its twelfth preambular paragraph and twelfth preambular paragraph (bis).

**The Chair:** I would like to express the Committee’s thanks to the interpreters for staying with us a little bit longer in order for us to complete our work today. However, I would encourage representatives taking the floor not to abuse the generosity of our interpreters.

**Mr. Proaño** (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): Ecuador voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.24, as we agree with its provisions and its subject matter, and my country has proceeded and continues to proceed on that basis.

However, we would also like to express our concern, as we did at the high-level meeting on countering nuclear terrorism held in September in New York, regarding the proliferation of forums in which issues of universal interest and concern are discussed by just

one group of States. That was the case with the Nuclear Security Summits held in Seoul and Washington, D.C., the decisions of which were neither discussed nor adopted by all States.

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to consider cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”.

I give the floor to those delegations wishing to make general statements.

**Mr. Hallak** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to thank the interpreters and the other Secretariat staff members who are allowing us to continue with our meeting.

I thank you, Sir, for having managed the work of the First Committee with distinction. Our Committee has had to deal with exceptional circumstances in the course of this session as a result of the wrath of nature — that is, Hurricane Sandy — and that is why the practices and rules of procedure of the Committee have been amended.

At your request, Sir, our delegation has demonstrated a great deal of flexibility, but at the same time, we would like to see a reference made in the official record of the meeting to the fact that the measures adopted at this session are not to serve as a precedent for the future work of the Committee. Many thematic debates have had to be cut short, and draft resolutions that have been amended or to which new wording has been added have not been made available in all the official languages of the United Nations or published on the official websites of the United Nations. That has surprised us greatly. We hope that the practices engaged in by the First Committee at this session will in no way create a precedent for the future.

**Mrs. Ledesma Hernández** (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Our delegation would like to make a general statement on this cluster, but first we would like to say that we share a number of the concerns that were just expressed by the representative of Syria. We trust that, in the future work of the Committee, the hasty decisions that we were forced to take as a result of the effects of the hurricane will in no way serve as a precedent for our future work.

As regards the matter at hand, our delegation would like to make a statement on draft decision A/C.1/67/L.58. Cuba fully supports draft decision A/C.1/67/L.58, entitled “Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly

Devoted to Disarmament”, which was introduced by the delegation of Indonesia on behalf of the members of the Non-Aligned Movement, and of which we are a sponsor.

Bearing in mind that it has not yet been possible to convene meetings of that Working Group, my delegation supports the draft decision, whereby the General Assembly would hold, at a later date, an organizational session of the Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament for the purpose of setting a date for its substantive sessions in 2013 and 2014, and submit a report on its work, including possible substantive recommendations, before the end of the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

Pursuant to resolution 65/66, the Working Group shall consider the objectives and agenda, including the possible establishment of the preparatory committee, for the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We believe that the draft decision is particularly important not only to the members of the Movement but to the international community as a whole, as it calls for efforts to achieve the best possible United Nations disarmament machinery.

As has been stated on a number of occasions by the Non-Aligned Movement, Cuba underscores the need to convene the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In this regard, we express our concern regarding the fact that this essential event has still not taken place.

In conclusion, we call on Member States to support draft decision A/C.1/67/L.58. We believe that the General Assembly should set up without further delay a preparatory committee in order to convene the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. To that end, we will have to overcome the prevailing lack of political will in this respect.

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/67/L.58.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Cherniavsky** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/67/L.58, entitled “Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament”, was introduced, under agenda item 94 (h), by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States

members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the 17th meeting, on 1 November. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/67/L.58.

The decision is accompanied by the oral statement by the Secretary-General which, with the Chair's permission, I will now read. The oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph (a) of draft decision A/C.1/67/L.58, the General Assembly, recalling its resolution 65/66 of 8 December 2010, would decide to hold, at a later date, an organizational session of the Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament for the purpose of setting a date for its substantive sessions in 2013 and 2014, and submit a report on its work, including possible substantive recommendations, before the end of the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

Pursuant to the request contained in paragraph (a) of the draft decision, it is envisaged that the Open-ended Working Group would hold in New York a one-day organizational session of two meetings in 2013; one session at five days per session, for a total of 10 meetings in 2013; and two sessions in 2014, amounting to 10 days, for a total of 20 meetings.

The estimated resource requirements for servicing those sessions are as follows:

a) \$139,000 for servicing 12 meetings to be held in 2013, including \$134,000 under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Affairs and conference management", and \$5,000 under section 29 D, "Office of Central Support Services", to provide interpretation services from and into six official languages and sound technician and technical support during those meetings;

(b) \$112,000 under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and conference management", for the translation of seven documents with a total number of 19,030 words into the six official languages in 2013;

(c) \$228,800 for servicing 20 meetings to be held in 2014, including \$222,800 under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and conference management", and \$6,000 under section 29 D, "Office of Central Support Services", to provide interpretation services from and into six

official languages and sound technician and technical support during those meetings; and

(d) \$306,900, under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and conference management", for the translation of 15 documents with a total number of 51,400 words into the six official languages in 2014.

It is determined that the total resource requirements of \$251,000 in 2013 to service the organizational meeting and the meetings of the Open-ended Working Group would be absorbed from within the provision to service the General Assembly on the understanding that the Open-ended Working Group cannot meet in parallel with the General Assembly and/or other working groups; that the exact dates for its meeting will be determined in consultations between the substantive secretariat and the Department of General Assembly and Conference Management; and that the documents of the Open-ended Working Group are submitted in time and within the estimated word count.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft decision A/C.1/67/L.58, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. The additional financial implications in 2014, totaling \$535,700, will be considered in the context of the finalization of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), 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, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, 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, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, 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, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

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

*Draft decision A/C.1/67/L.58 was adopted by 171 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.59.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Cherniavsky** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.59, entitled "Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa", was introduced, under agenda item 95 (e), by the representative of Burundi on behalf of the 11 members of the Committee at the 18th meeting, on 2 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/67/L.59.

The draft resolution is accompanied by an oral statement by the Secretary-General which, with the

Chair's permission, I will now read. The oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 4, 7 and 15 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.59, the General Assembly would encourage States members of the Standing Advisory Committee to implement the Declaration on a road map for counter-terrorism and non-proliferation of arms in Central Africa, and request the United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa, the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism, and the international community to support those measures.

The Assembly would request the United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa, in collaboration with the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, to facilitate the efforts undertaken by the States members of the Standing Advisory Committee, in particular for their execution of the Implementation Plan for the Kinshasa Convention, as adopted on 19 November 2010 at their thirty-first ministerial meeting, held in Brazzaville from 15 to 19 November 2010.

Lastly, the Assembly would express its satisfaction to the Secretary-General for his support for the revitalization of the activities of the Standing Advisory Committee, and request him to continue to provide the assistance needed to ensure the success of its regular biannual meetings.

The implementation of the request contained in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, regarding the provision of the support needed for the implementation of the Declaration on a road map for counter-terrorism and non-proliferation of arms in Central Africa, would be subject to the availability of voluntary contributions to the United Nations Office for Central Africa, the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, as well as additional funding for the design and implementation of a regional counter-terrorism strategy called for under the road map.

In addition, the implementation of the request contained in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, regarding the facilitation of efforts undertaken by the States members of the Standing Advisory Committee, in particular for their execution of the Implementation Plan for the Kinshasa Convention, would be subject to

the availability of voluntary contributions to the United Nations Office for Central Africa and the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs.

Moreover, the implementation of the request contained in paragraph 15 of the draft resolution, regarding the provision of the assistance needed to ensure the success of the Standing Advisory Committee's regular biannual meetings, would be carried out within the resources provided in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.59 would not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed budget for biennium 2012-2013.

**The Chair:** The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee 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.59 was adopted.*

**The Chair:** I call on those delegations wishing to take the floor in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

**Mr. Hoffmann** (Germany): On behalf of Estonia, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden and my own country, Germany, I wish to explain our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.58, entitled "Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament".

In 2010, as in 2007, we voted in favour of resolution 65/66 on the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD-IV). Our decision to do so at the time was based on the conviction that the United Nations disarmament machinery urgently needed political impulses towards its revitalization in order to allow it to resume its main task — negotiating multilateral instruments in the field of disarmament. We would like to point out in that connection that we also support draft resolutions A/C.1/67/L.41, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", and A/C.1/67/L.46, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations".

In our view, there exists a relationship between the underlying considerations on the objectives of all three resolutions. They are not contradictory, but

rather complementary efforts, aimed at the same goal of revitalizing the multilateral disarmament machinery. We would like to stress, however, that the pursuit of an SSOD-IV cannot be an alternative or a reason to postpone the work that needs to be done now, especially getting the Conference on Disarmament back to work and implementing relevant disarmament and non-proliferation commitments, notably those contained in the action plan decided at the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Finally, we would like to emphasize that we deem the financial resources needed to convene the organizational session of the Open-ended Working Group to be subject to the regular budgetary procedure and scrutiny of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, as well as of the Fifth Committee.

**Ms. González-Román** (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation is honoured to take the floor in explanation of vote on behalf of seven countries on draft decision A/C.1/67/L.58. I shall continue in English as the text of the explanation of vote is a consensus text.

(*spoke in English*)

I speak on behalf of the Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania and my own country, Spain. As on previous occasions, we voted in favour of draft decision A/C.1/67/L.58, entitled "Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament", introduced at the present session by the representative of Indonesia. Our decision was based on the conviction that the United Nations disarmament machinery needs serious attention and political impetus with a view to its revitalization to allow it to resume work on its main task — negotiating multilateral instruments in the field of disarmament.

This year we voted in favour of draft decision A/C.1/67/L.58 since we consider it to be complementary to other initiatives pursuing the same goal of revitalizing the disarmament machinery, which we deem very necessary and urgent. We also would like to underline the importance of ensuring that the resources needed to convene the Open-ended Working Group will be identified within the United Nations regular budget, inasmuch as there are no additional budgetary implications for the current 2012-2013 budget or for the budget of the following biennium.

**Mr. Pollard** (United Kingdom): I will be brief. I am taking the floor on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States on draft decision A/C.1/67/L.58.

Draft decision A/C.1/67/L.58 is based on resolution 65/66, on which our three delegations abstained in the voting on budgetary and substantive grounds. In our view, those reasons remain valid and therefore our delegations decided to maintain our abstention.

**The Chair:** We have thus concluded action on the draft resolutions and decisions contained in informal paper 4.

In accordance with our programme of work, our last order of business is to adopt the programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2013, as contained in document A/C.1/67/CRP.5/Rev.1, which has been distributed to all delegations. Delegations will notice that the document has been prepared based on the practices of the Committee in previous years, especially with regard to the total number of meetings allocated to the specific stages of the Committee's work.

I would remind all delegations that the First Committee shares its conference facilities and other resources with the Fourth Committee. Consequently, the programmes of work of both Committees are closely coordinated. Accordingly, the draft programme of the First Committee for 2013, which delegations have before them, was drawn up in consultation with the Chairman of the Fourth Committee. The two Committees will continue to coordinate their work and maintain a sequential pattern of conducting their meetings in order to maximize shared resources.

The draft programme under consideration will, of course, be finalized and issued in its final form before the First Committee starts its substantive work at its next session.

May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for the 2013, as contained in document A/C.1/67/CRP.5/Rev.1?

*It was so decided.*

#### **Statement by the Chair**

**The Chair:** We have come to the end of our deliberations for this year, and I want to congratulate each and every participant for our collective success in

concluding our work today. What an honour it has been for me to sit up here as the First Committee Chair for a total of 66 hours, 20 working days and 22 meetings, giving delegations the floor and enjoying the beautiful view of a full and lively conference room.

As all will agree, our deliberations this year were marked by both positive and challenging developments. On the positive side, there was a carry-over of the high energy and enthusiasm that delegations developed during the arms trade treaty and small arms conferences, both of which were held shortly before the opening of this session of the First Committee. On the other hand, the tragic hurricane that made landfall during the long weekend of 26 October placed everybody under house arrest for five days, and we lost three working days.

The Committee, while empathizing with those most affected, was frantic to find an effective strategy to make up the lost time. It is for such dire situations that the English came up with the proverb that says "necessity is the mother of invention". That is to say, when people really need to do something, they just do it, and that is not just the Nike slogan. That necessity brought out the best in us working as one, compelling us to dig deep into our creative and problem-solving minds to come up with the Sandy formula, which all delegations agreed to embrace and which helped us to speed up our work and conclude much of our thematic debate segment in record time.

For delegations' support and cooperation in that regard, I am most grateful. It is possible that delegations were thinking of the words of America's Benjamin Franklin, who illustrated the value of cooperation in the face of difficult challenges by telling his audience, "We must, indeed, all hang together, or most assuredly we shall all hang separately". I can see from here that the delegation of the United States is nodding in agreement with that proverb. I thank the members of the Committee for hanging with me, even as we skipped our lunch today.

This year, the Committee finished its work in exactly four weeks and on schedule, with 22 meetings — two meetings fewer than in the programme of work — despite the wrath of Sandy. That is by any measure a remarkable achievement, at least from the Chair's point of view, and the Committee can proudly claim bragging rights to that. In the course of the session, 89 delegations made statements within the general debate, while over 187 delegations spoke during the thematic discussion segment. The longest statements, I would dare say,

were those made on behalf of the European Union and the Non-Aligned Movement during the opening of the general debate.

During the action phase, the Committee adopted 53 draft resolutions and six draft decisions. Thirty-two of those were adopted by a recorded vote. Another 26 were adopted without a vote, which corresponds to approximately 30 per cent of all action taken, and which is a marked drop compared to last year's record of 62 per cent adopted without a vote. This year was a lesser achievement.

Let me conclude — and this is really my conclusion — by expressing my sincere appreciation to all members once again for the opportunity to chair the First Committee at this year's session. It has been an incredibly rewarding experience, and I thank each and every delegation for its constructive spirit, cooperation, flexibility and support, without which the task at hand would have been difficult, given the additional challenges we faced this year. I commend all delegations for making it possible for us to utilize the time and facilities allocated to the First Committee this year in a truly efficient manner through the adoption and gainful application of the Sandy formula. For their rallying support in that regard, I am truly indebted.

My sincere appreciation goes to my fellow Bureau members, the three Vice-Chairs, Mr. Dovydas Špokauskas of Lithuania, Mr. Alexis Aquino of Peru, who is sitting behind his boss, and Mr. Salim Mohamed Salim of Kenya, and the Rapporteur, Mr. Knut Langeland of Norway. They have all assisted me tremendously in my efforts to discharge my functions as Chair effectively. I thank them very much and express my love to them.

On behalf of the Committee, I offer my gratitude to the Office for Disarmament Affairs and the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, headed by High Representative Angela Kane and Under-Secretary-General Jean-Jacques Graise, respectively, for their invaluable technical and substantive support to the Committee, as always.

I would also like to convey my heartfelt thanks to the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Sergei Cherniavsky, who sometimes needs to take a breath while reading out oral statements and programme budget implications, and his team of the First Committee secretariat: Sonia, Jullyette, Ruby, Lidija, Gerard, Sam, Karin and Patrick, and my intern Trianna. I thank them very much for all

their support and for helping us to facilitate the work of the Committee.

Special thanks also go to all the interpreters, translators, record keepers, press officers, document officers, conference officers and sound engineers who have been diligently working behind the scenes in order to support the Committee's work.

I now call on delegations wishing to make closing statements.

**Mr. Najafi** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor very briefly on behalf of the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement to thank you wholeheartedly, Mr. Chair, for a job well done and for the efficient and excellent manner in which you steered the work of the Committee. We thank you, the other members of the Bureau, the Secretary of the Committee, the Secretariat, the Office for Disarmament Affairs, the interpreters and all representatives who worked hand in hand and made this session a success.

**Mr. Moktefi** (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): I will be very brief. Following the adoption of the programme of work of the First Committee at its sixty-seventh session, my delegation requests that the following be included in the records of this session. The manner in which the First Committee worked this year should in no way set a precedent for its future work. Indeed, our delegations were working under several constraints and a lot of pressure, and we would not like to see that recur.

In closing, we would like to thank you, Sir, very warmly for the manner in which you were able to manage our work. We also thank the Committee secretariat and all staff who worked with us, including the interpreters.

**Mr. Hoffmann** (Germany): I asked for the floor, Mr. Chair, because I feared that you would close the meeting before anyone could take the floor to say a few words of thanks.

Let me say that this is my fourth session in the First Committee, and I imagine that there are not many in the room who have served longer than four sessions. I also think that I may have the whitest hair in the room, and since most representatives have already beaten a retreat, I wanted to thank you on behalf of perhaps most of our colleagues here for the excellent way in which you have conducted our work. This is a particular pleasure because you are an old Geneva hand, and it was a particular pleasure to see you in the Chair. I thank you for the way you have conducted the work here, and

I would include in our thanks the entire Committee secretariat and the interpreters, who really did a lot of overtime today.

**The Chair:** With representatives' indulgence, I would like to announce that this has been the last session of the First Committee for its Secretary, Mr. Sergei Cherniavsky. He is retiring this year. On behalf of the Committee, I would like to express our sincere appreciation for his service and cooperation with the Committee. It has been an honour and a pleasure to work with him. Although this is not normal practice, I would like to invite colleagues to give him a round of applause.

On an exceptional basis, Mr. Cherniavsky has asked to take the floor in exercise of the right of reply. I give him the floor.

**Mr. Cherniavsky** (Secretary of the First Committee): This will be the most pleasant right of reply you may ever hear, Sir. I would like to thank the Committee for its appreciation of my work. It has really been a privilege and a pleasure to work with the Committee. I wish everyone well. Even though I am retiring, I will only be a telephone call away. I will be around, if anyone needs any advice. The Committee can always call on me as a friend.

**The Chair:** The main part of the sixty-seventh session of the First Committee has thus concluded. The Committee shall reconvene some time in May or June 2013 to elect its Chairperson for the sixty-eighth session.

Let me conclude my remarks by wishing all those who are leaving a safe trip home.

*The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.*