



General Assembly

Sixty-ninth session

First Committee

22nd meeting

Friday, 31 October 2014, 3 p.m.

New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Rattray (Jamaica)

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Agenda items 87 to 104 (continued)

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

The Chair: This afternoon the Committee will continue to take action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under agenda items 87 to 104. We will be guided by the same procedure I explained previously, which is also outlined in the ground rules circulated in the Conference room at the beginning of the action segment.

We will begin with the draft resolutions and decisions contained in informal paper 3, which has been circulated among delegations and which contains the remaining drafts on informal paper 2, as well as new draft proposals that are ready for action today.

Accordingly, the Committee will now turn to the draft resolutions and decisions listed under cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security", in informal paper 3.

I now give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions under cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

Mr. Biontino (Germany): My delegation has the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.46, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures", on behalf of its sponsors.

Germany first introduced this traditional biennial resolution in 1996. The draft resolution promotes a comprehensive and integrated approach to arms control and disarmament matters. It combines a wide variety of aspects ranging from confidence-building measures to peacekeeping and intends to achieve tangible results within a foreseeable time frame.

The concept of practical disarmament goes back to former Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali's agenda for peace. Since then measures to control small arms and light weapons such as securing State-owned stockpiles, marking and tracing of weapons, and the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants have led to results with a direct impact on the lives of peoples and countries affected by conflict.

A concrete expression of the draft resolution's intent is the work of the Group of Interested States on Practical Disarmament Measures. The Group provides for a forum to exchange views, shape good practices and discuss concepts. Moreover, it facilitates the matching of assistance needs and available resources between donor and beneficiary States. Participation in the Group is open to States, international and regional organizations and interested non-governmental organizations. In recent years, the Group of Interested States has been focusing more strongly on project work with regard to the control of small arms and light weapons. It promotes the exchange of information and best practices with regard to small arms control, including stockpile management and marking and tracing. Projects in implementation of the United

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in 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-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

14-59810 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



Nations Programme of Action have become its main area of work.

The 2012 second 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, as well as this year's Fifth Biennial Meeting of States, have acknowledged the role and contribution of the Group in the implementation of the Programme. The Group is also exploring a new approach to how recent developments in small arms technology can be applied effectively to capacity-building projects in conflict and post-conflict contexts. Germany wishes to thank in particular the sponsors of the draft resolution for their support.

Ms. Del Sol Dominguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to make a general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.26, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security", which Cuba is co-sponsoring.

The hostile use of telecommunications with the purpose of subverting the internal legal order of other States is a violation of recognized international norms in this area. Acts of this nature create tensions and situations that are detrimental to the promotion of international peace and security and undermine the principles and purposes set forth in the Charter of the United Nations.

Cuba fully shares the concern expressed in the draft resolution with regard to the use of information and communications technologies (ICTs) for purposes that are not compatible with international peace and security. They have an adverse effect on the internal legal order of States and on their civilian and military sectors. The draft resolution adequately emphasizes the need to avoid the use of information technology and resources for criminal or terrorist purposes.

It has come to light that a complex plan of the Government of the United States environment known as ZunZuneo, into which millions of dollars were invested to promote subversion in Cuba through the use of a messenger service on social networks, was used to subvert our country, in violation of international law. The Non-Aligned Movement, the Group of 77, the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, and the Bolivarian Alliance for the Americas have denounced these practices and rejected them,

while emphasizing that the use of ICTs should be fully compatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law.

We also wish to reiterate our rejection of any covert and illegal use by individuals, organizations and States of information systems belonging to other nations to harass and attack third countries because that has the potential to cause international conflict.

My delegation once again denounces the aggression that the United States Government has been carrying out via radio and television against Cuba for many decades now, which violates the principles of international law and international norms regulating the radio spectrum. During the period from May 2013 to July 2014 alone, there were some 1,882.86 hours of weekly illegal and subversive transmissions against Cuba. They used some 27 different radio frequencies. At the same time, the illegal transmission of television signals was also carried out without our country's consent. A number of the broadcasters belong to or provide their services to organizations that are linked to known terrorist elements that currently act against Cuba from the United States territory. They broadcast programmes that constitute incitement to sabotage, political attacks and other such incidents, as well as radio terrorism.

The illegal transmission of radio and television programmes against Cuba serves only to undermine the purpose of broadcasting information. They are trying to destabilize and subvert the order in Cuba. This affects normal functioning of radio communication services and also causes interference in various radio and television stations in Cuba. The World Radiocommunication Conference in Geneva has repeatedly stated that these actions of transmission broadcasts against Cuba are illegal and run counter to radio communications regulations.

Undoubtedly there is enormous potential in terms of the benefits of the use of ICTs for economic development, education, medicine and other areas in modern society. At the same time, their use for purposes counter to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations — for example, global espionage violating human rights, the right to privacy and the right to the information of citizens — should be rejected and denounced as a violation of the principle of the sovereignty of States and international law. We hope that draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.26 will, as it has on previous occasions, enjoy the support of many delegations.

Mr. Lindell (Sweden): My statement is a bit long. I will try not to read it at too fast a pace. It is on the same topic.

I have the honour to make the following general statement with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.26, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". This statement is made on behalf of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, Uruguay and my own country, Sweden.

We join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.26. We would, however, like to stress some relevant aspects in this context. International deliberations on cyberspace issues and the use of information and communications technologies (ICTs) in an international security context need to continue to evolve as we seek greater common understanding and shared views on these issues globally. One noteworthy development in this regard was the adoption on 24 June 2013 of a report by the third United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security.

The 2012-2013 Group made a significant contribution towards building an effective framework for international norms of responsible behaviour by States, on the basis of existing international law and practical cooperative measures. We welcome these efforts and the adoption by consensus of the report. We also encourage the new Group of Governmental Experts, which held its first session this past July, to build and advance this important work while fully taking some crucial principles and concepts into account.

One fundamental point for our delegations regarding the key features of the Internet is that it should remain open, thereby facilitating a free flow of information in cyberspace. For us, one principle is very basic. The same rights that individuals have offline must also be protected online, in particular freedom of expression, including the freedom to seek and impart information, and freedom of assembly and association. Hence, we welcome Human Rights Council resolution

20/8, adopted at the Council's twentieth session in 2012, which affirms this basic understanding. We note that the resolution was adopted by consensus, giving it a very broad cross-regional backing. A follow-up resolution, 26/13, was adopted by the Human Rights Council without a vote on 20 June this year, reaffirming the main messages from the 2012 resolution while including important additions on the importance of Internet access for global development and the right to education. While we would have preferred a direct reference to the Human Rights Council resolution 20/8, we note the reference, introduced last year, in draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.26 to the importance of respect for human rights in the use of ICTs as an important step in the right direction.

An open, free and secure Internet used for peaceful purposes is essential for economic, social and political development in the twenty-first century. The Internet has developed successfully without Government control. The bottom-up, innovation-driven approach to building the Internet has been the key to its success, and mirrors the distributed character of the underlying technology. Another fundamental position of our delegations is therefore that discussions with wider implications for the future of the Internet should be based on a multi-stakeholder approach that includes private sector and civil society actors.

Our societies' increasing dependence on information technology has brought with it new challenges. Security in an increasingly interconnected world will, to a great extent, revolve around protecting information flows and the integrity of critical ICT infrastructures. Cyberattacks, cyberespionage and cybercrime, as well as a lack of public awareness of the everyday aspects of cybersecurity, are realities in today's cyberspace, and these risks and vulnerabilities need to be addressed. That also implies challenges, as our traditional tools of addressing these risks have yet to adapt to the global and boundless nature of cyberspace.

It is clear, however, that the work against threats to our freedom and security in cyberspace can be tackled effectively only through global cooperation between States as well as the private sector and civil society. In this regard, we welcome the reference made to the role of the private sector and civil society in the report of the Group of Governmental Experts and emphasize the crucial importance of taking all relevant stakeholders into account on an equal and appropriate footing while advancing this important work. We also welcome the

reference made to the importance of capacity-building to an effective global effort on securing ICTs and their use. We support the proposed measures and will welcome further international commitment to such work.

In addressing cyberchallenges we must continue to engage in an international discussion on norms and principles of responsible State behaviour consistent with the affirmation by the recent report of the Group of Governmental Experts that international law is applicable in guiding State activities in cyberspace, while underscoring as well the key role to be played by confidence-building and transparency measures. In this regard, we strongly support the affirmation made by the 2012-2013 Group that the application of norms relevant to the use of ICTs by States is an essential measure to reduce risks to international peace, security and stability. We also welcome the recommendation of the Group of Governmental Experts on the need for further study on common understandings of how such norms should apply to State behaviour and the use of ICTs by States.

The 2013 report of the Group of Governmental Experts underlines the fact that voluntary confidence-building measures can promote trust and assurance among States and help to reduce the risk of conflict by increasing predictability and reducing misperception. Such measures can make an important contribution to addressing the concerns of States over the use of ICTs by States and could be a significant step towards promoting international security. We support these recommendations and encourage further work along those lines, including in regional security and confidence-building frameworks.

We engage in these discussions on the basis that existing international law is applicable and that our universal values of human rights, democracy and the rule of law guide our deliberations on norms in cyberspace. We call for these crucial aspects to guide further work in the cyber area, including in the context of addressing international security aspects of the use of ICTs in the format of the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts.

Mr. Shpakovsky (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): The delegation of Belarus is speaking on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.26, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

We cannot imagine contemporary society today without information technologies, the dynamic development of which allows us to note that cyberspace has become one of the key elements of the strategic infrastructure of humankind. It is clear that protecting cyberspace from criminal assaults is a critical task requiring agreed actions on the part of all States of the world. Only through joint efforts will we be able to combat cybercrime, which is constantly changing and being improved.

Cyberspace is increasingly being used for crimes committed under the guise of personal freedom of expression. Belarus is implementing a responsible policy to counteract cybercrime, and a Belarusian representative is actively participating in the work of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security. Under these conditions Belarus is, as is our custom, sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.26, which seeks to unite the efforts of the international community to ensure the security of cyberspace. We call on all States to support this draft resolution.

Mr. Buffin (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): The delegation of Belgium would like to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.43, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”. Belgium will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

The date of 20 June 2009 saw the entry into force of the Act of 11 May 2007, published by the *Moniteur belge* of 20 June 2007, supplementing the Law on Prohibited Weapons of 8 June 2006. The Law of 11 May 2007 classifies as prohibited weapons inactive munitions and armour containing depleted uranium or any other type of industrial uranium. The adoption of this Law was preceded by parliamentary hearings during which scientists expressed their views and various points of view were brought to light given the assessment of the danger caused to the health and environment by the use of depleted uranium armaments.

Belgium pays the greatest attention to any development in the scientific analysis of dangers connected with the use of depleted uranium weapon systems, including studies being carried out at the international level. Belgium was the first country in the world to have declared such a prohibition, referencing the principles of caution and carefulness. Belgium is

available to the United Nations for any clarification concerning the definitions, goals and modalities of the Belgian Law of 11 May 2007. It also expresses its readiness and, if needed, offers its expertise in order to inform any interested State if it receives a request — in particular from States that are currently establishing legislation in this area — on the basis of the Belgian legislative experience.

Belgium hopes that the draft resolution that we will adopt in the First Committee will contribute to a better understanding at the international level of the possible effects of depleted uranium ammunition in order to come to a joint evaluation in a timely manner.

Ms. Ledesma-Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Under this cluster, Cuba would like to introduce a series of draft resolutions it is co-sponsoring along with the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The following four draft resolutions address very important issues for the international community. They are as follows: draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.43, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”; draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.41, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”; draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.39, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”; and draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.42, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”.

Environmental norms should be fully taken into account when negotiating treaties and agreements on disarmament and arms limitation. That is indeed set forth in draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.41, which affirms that all States should contribute to the implementation of these norms when they implement treaties and conventions to which they are a party.

Cuba believes that draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.39 makes an important contribution to the search for multilateral, effective and lasting solutions in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. The legitimate concern of the international community with regard to the effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium is such that the draft resolution takes a very balanced and comprehensive approach to this concern, as stated in draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.43.

Bearing in mind that there remain significant scientific uncertainties about the long-term

environmental effects of depleted uranium, particularly because of its long-term impact and contamination of ground water, and as a first step, a very precautionary approach should be taken to the use of depleted uranium. Research must continue in order to determine the long-term effects of depleted uranium on health and the environment. We also urge countries to provide assistance to affected States, in particular to identify and manage contaminated sites and materials.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.42, we reiterate that disarmament and development are two of the main challenges facing humankind. It is unacceptable that worldwide some \$1.75 trillion is devoted to military spending when it could be invested in order to fight extreme poverty and to foster development among all nations. We reiterate and repeat our proposal to create a fund administered by the United Nations which would be allocated at least half of current global military expenditure in order to meet economic and social development needs.

We urge all delegations to show their support for the draft resolutions submitted by the Non-Aligned Movement under this cluster, and we are confident that they will receive a favourable vote from the vast majority of delegations as has been the case with similar resolutions in previous years.

The Chair: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes or positions before the Committee takes action on the draft resolutions and decisions listed under cluster 5, “Other disarmament measures and international security”.

Mr. Sano (Japan): Japan takes the floor to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.43, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”. Japan will vote in favour of this draft resolution.

In accordance with resolution 67/36, adopted by the General Assembly in December 2012, Japan has submitted to the Secretary-General its views on the effects of the use of depleted uranium armaments and ammunitions.

As we communicated to the Secretary-General, Japan has neither used nor possessed armaments or ammunition that contain depleted uranium. We recognize that despite the studies conducted by relevant international organizations on the effects of the use of this type of munition on human health and the

environment, at present no internationally definitive conclusion has been drawn. Japan will continue to follow the developments in the studies conducted by the relevant international organizations.

In this connection we would like to call on all relevant international organizations to conduct successive on-site studies and further information-gathering, including the latest scientific findings. At the same time we ask that these organizations pay due attention to the opinions and activities of the interested non-governmental organizations in this field, and provide their views on the effect that the use of depleted uranium munitions may, or can, cause on the human body as well as the environment.

Mr. An Myong Hun (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments". Nuclear disarmament comes as an overriding priority in building a peaceful and prosperous world. The major blocks to achieving disarmament at present are the pursuit of the doctrine of hegemony and power politics of the Cold War era and undisguised armed demonstrations, threats, blackmail and the open use of wartime tools.

Nuclear power politics based on double standards make disarmament-related legal instruments such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) merely nominal and drive the world into a nuclear arms race. The main reason for a long-standing lack of progress in the Conference on Disarmament and other United Nations disarmament machinery in general is also due to the continued one-sided insistence on non-proliferation only while putting aside the urgency of nuclear disarmament.

While preambular and operative paragraphs of the draft resolution contain references to compliance with disarmament agreements in a manner consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, there is no reference at all to the nuclear disarmament obligation of the main sponsor State, which is the major country responsible for genuine implementation of the Charter and substantial nuclear disarmament. Rather, the draft resolution, under cover of pushing a one-sided implementation of non-proliferation and disarmament agreements that reflect the strategic interests of the United States, it tries to dispute — and the draft itself defends — the

capabilities of sovereign States and implies pursuit of disarming them without any consideration for their respective security concerns.

The sponsor also tries only to urge or instruct other United Nations Members to observe or implement disarmament agreements or commitments while putting aside its implementation of the commitment for bilateral and multilateral agreements. My delegation believes the draft resolution in its essence has nothing to do with genuine nuclear disarmament obligations based on the Charter of the United Nations and pursues the aim of disarming other countries. Therefore my delegation will abstain on that draft resolution.

Ms. Garcia Guiza (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to speak in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments". Mexico has voted in favour of this draft resolution from the outset. It supports the provisions with regard to current disarmament and arms control initiatives. These include article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which to date has not yet been implemented or fully complied with. We also support the reference to the NPT Review Conference and also the issue of principles and objectives for disarmament.

The agreements that were reached at the 2000 and 2010 NPT Review Conferences are also extremely important and we support them. Mexico believes that the nations that should be doing so are not playing the role that they should in implementing international agreements on disarmament. Nevertheless, Mexico will support the draft resolution because it believes that it is extremely important to call the international community's attention to the need for all countries to implement these provisions. We believe it important for all countries to implement the provisions of the agreements to which they are a party, particularly under the non-proliferation and disarmament regime.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Cuba would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments". Cuba has always championed the need to preserve and strengthen multilateralism, as well as to guarantee strict observance of all disarmament and non-proliferation

agreements. Nevertheless, we believe that draft resolution A/C.1.69/L.45 does not adequately address this issue.

For many years now, resolutions on this item have been adopted by consensus and also supported by Cuba. Unfortunately, beginning in 2005, the language of the text began to be negatively amended by the authors and unanimity was lost. The current draft does not bring us any closer to consensus. On the contrary, the main weaknesses that have characterized the text in recent years are only repeated here. I shall cite eight of those weaknesses and shortcomings.

First, the text does not have a sufficient focus on cooperation, which should characterize our efforts to address this issue.

Second, the language of the draft resolution has been formulated with the express intent of highlighting non-proliferation to the detriment of the issue of disarmament.

Third, the phrase “States parties”, which appeared until 2005, has been completely eliminated from the operative part of the draft resolution.

Fourth, the draft resolution continues to omit the important reference to the need to resolve problems with States’ compliance in accordance with the established compliance mechanisms provided for in the relative provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. The subjective and unilateral evaluations of non-compliance and any attempt to use these assessments for political purposes will only undermine international efforts to strengthen disarmament and non-proliferation initiatives.

Fifth, the role of the United Nations in restoring integrity to disarmament agreements seems to have been disregarded. Also disregarded is its role in arms limitation and non-proliferation, and its role in promoting negotiations on these agreements.

Sixth, the draft resolution ignores the basic principle of the indivisibility of compliance with obligations undertaken by States. Inexplicably, this was eliminated from the text beginning with resolution 57/86. On the basis of that principle, all States parties should be encouraged and urged to implement and fully comply with all provisions of agreements to which they are parties. In disregarding this principle draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45 once again provides an opportunity for unacceptable interpretations of treaty law. In this case,

States parties could refuse to comply with some of their obligations that stem from these treaties.

Seventh, the draft resolution also presupposes non-compliance of obligations by some States and encourages them to adopt a strategic decision to make another effort to comply with them, this, despite the fact that the principles of international law call for a legal sequence of actions. The call for States that do not comply with the provisions, should be preceded by a statement of failure to comply with the provisions of each treaty.

Finally, the text disregards the fact that in each treaty and agreement there are specific characteristics, modalities and mechanisms so it is counterproductive to try to address all these causes from a sole perspective. That is why the Cuban delegation cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45 and will abstain in the voting thereon.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): I am speaking on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States to explain our negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.43, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”.

This is not a new issue. The environmental and long-term health effects of the use of depleted uranium munitions have been thoroughly investigated by the World Health Organization, the United Nations Environment Programme, the International Atomic Energy Agency, NATO, the Centers for Disease Control, the European Commission, and others. None of these inquiries has documented long-term environmental or health effects attributable to the use of these munitions. It is therefore regrettable that the conclusions of these studies are thus ignored and that the authors are calling for further studies without taking into account the existing research.

It is further regrettable that the sponsors of the draft resolution have failed to quote the response from 2010 from the United Nations Environment Programme in its entirety and tried a partial quotation to strengthen their alleged claim. This quote reads as follows:

“The main scientific findings were consistent across the three assessments. Measurements taken at the depleted uranium sites showed that, even in areas with widespread depleted uranium contamination, the overall levels of radioactivity

were low and within acceptable international standards, with no immediate dangers from either particle-based or waterborne toxicity.” (A/65/129/Add.1, III, para. 4)

Given the lack of tangible evidence to the contrary we do not recognize the presupposed potential risk to health and the environment and therefore do not support United Nations resolutions that presuppose depleted uranium is harmful.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation is speaking to outline the reasons for its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”. The Russian delegation plans to abstain in the voting on this document. Our decision is due to several well-thought-out reasons.

The Russian Federation has consistently and comprehensively implemented its obligations in the areas of non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament. Moreover, we support initiatives aimed at completing and universalizing existing international legal instruments. We are striving to develop, on a consensus basis, new, legally binding agreements, where needed, on a consensual basis, and which would be acceptable to everyone. The draft resolution on non-proliferation and disarmament agreements could of course play a positive role and we in general support its overall constructive potential, which, if it were correctly implemented would make a strong contribution to achieving our common goal, which is of course the maintenance of international peace and security.

At the same time, let us look at what is really happening. What is really happening is that the sponsors of the draft resolution initiated the important resolution on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and then, after two decades, refused to ratify it. The sponsors of this draft resolution are the depositaries of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, and again over a period of two decades they are refusing to develop a legally binding protocol to strengthen the provisions of the Convention on Biological Weapons.

Moreover, the sponsors of this draft resolution retain their reservations on the Geneva Protocol, which

contravenes the obligations under the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction. Moreover, as demonstrated yesterday when we were voting on the draft resolution on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space, the authors of the draft resolution are blocking the efforts of the international community to prevent an arms race in outer space, as well as any attempt at dialogue to that end.

We could continue talking about why the sponsors are taking these actions, but in order to save time we would simply note the comments made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation on 1 August in connection with the publication of the annual report of the United States State Department giving the official, objective picture of developments in compliance with international obligations in arms control. However, we find no reference in the report to information on the genuine, sensitive situation and developments in that area.

In the context of today’s draft resolution, we would like to caution against the publication of such provocative documents. We have a very well-developed mechanism in the area of arms control for weapons of mass destruction for specific types of weapons and for the prevention of their dissemination. There are active mechanisms for observing these agreements. Let us focus our work on these mechanisms. In particular, we could have followed operative paragraph 5 of the proposed resolution, which we fully support, in particular the conscientious compliance with the mechanisms provided for in the international instrument to solve the issues, related to the implementation of such obligations.

Russia has consistently spoken for and will continue to speak for the strongest cooperation to resolve any dispute in any situation of potential non-compliance with treaty obligations under existing conventions and, when necessary, through political and diplomatic means. We wish not to engage in propaganda work but to take specific steps to implement international legal norms in the area of arms control. Therefore, Russia this time will abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. Biontino (Germany): This year Germany will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.43, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”. Germany

continues to regret that the results of the 2010 report of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (A/65/129) continue to be quoted in a selective and misleading way. The UNEP report also stated that the measured overall levels of radioactivity were low and within acceptable international standards with no immediate danger from either particle-based or waterborne toxicity. These findings have not been adequately reflected in the seventh preambular paragraph.

In 2012, my country gave an explanation of vote on the inadequate reflection of the content of the UNEP study. Unfortunately, no correction has been made in the meantime. In addition, the fifth preambular paragraph and new operative paragraph 7 do not include the findings of the 2012 report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (A/67/177) that concluded, inter alia, that in general the existence of depleted uranium residues dispersed in the environment and in the manner they were observed during the monitoring campaigns did not pose a radiological hazard to the local populations.

Germany holds the view that the effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium should be studied further. We will continue to follow the discussions on this topic closely. Therefore it is with regret that this year's text does not allow it to support the draft resolution.

Ms. Bila (Ukraine): Ukraine will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments". That is because we always understand and support the necessity and importance of the issue of compliance with non-proliferation international agreements. We have proved it by being a consistent partner for 20 years. We refused nuclear weapons, as a member of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), and we proved that we can implement this decision.

The Ukrainian delegation deeply regrets the position explained by the Russian Federation because, by that explanation, they have proved that non-compliance with international treaties such as the NPT was not a mistake but the official position of the country to break those resolutions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions and decisions under cluster 5.

The Committee will now take action on draft decision A/C.1/69/L.13, entitled "Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/69/L.13 was introduced by the representative of India at the 19th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/69/L.13.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft decision A/C.1/69/L.13 has expressed the wish that it 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 decision A/C.1/69/L.13 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.26, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.26 was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 19th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.26 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.5.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.26 have expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.26 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.39, entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.39 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the

19th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/69/L.39.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New

Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tonga, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.39 was adopted by 122 votes to 4, with 48 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.41, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.41 was introduced 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 19th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/69/L.41.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.41 have expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.41 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.42, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.42 was introduced 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 19th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/69/L.42.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.42 have expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.42 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.43, entitled

“Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.43 was introduced 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 19th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/69/L.43.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, 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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan,

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.43 was adopted by 143 votes to 4, with 26 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45 was introduced by the representative of the United States at the 19th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.45 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.5. In addition, Cyprus and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia have become sponsors.

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, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan,

Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, 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, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45 was adopted by 160 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.46, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.46 was just introduced by the representative of Germany. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.46 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.4. In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedures of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.46, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide the Office for Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat with resources adequate for maintaining the Programme of Action Implementation Support System, thus securing its important role in identifying and communicating information on needs and resources so as to enhance the implementation of the Programme of Action.

With reference to this provision of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.46, it is envisaged that the existing extra-budgetary resources would be sufficient for maintaining the Programme of Action Implementation Support System for the biennium 2014-2015. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.46, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.46 have expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.46 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.52, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.52 was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 19th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.52 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.4. In addition, Paraguay and Panama have become sponsors.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.52 have expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.52 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.53.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.53 was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 19th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.53 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.4. In addition, Albania and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia have become sponsors.

Concerning this draft resolution, the title of the draft resolution is being orally corrected as follows. The current title, “Disarmament and non-proliferation education”, will now be corrected by adding the following phrase “United Nations study on” at the beginning of the title, so that the full title of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.53 will read “United Nations study on disarmament and non-proliferation education”.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.53 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee, as orally corrected, without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.53, as orally corrected, was adopted.

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

Mr. Aljowaily (Egypt): I take the floor to explain Egypt’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”. Egypt abstained in the voting on the draft resolution for several reasons. We were eager for the text to return to the consensual language that was last adopted at the fifty-seventh session. We engaged constructively with the main sponsor in aspiring to reach that result. Despite a few improvements resulting from restoring selective texts from the earlier consensual draft, the current version kept the language that had caused concern and resulted in the changed pattern of adoption by consensus to adoption by a recorded vote.

Egypt still believes that the scope of the draft resolution extends beyond disarmament, non-proliferation, and arms control agreements as it refers to other commitments that are not clearly defined. Additionally, our reservations remain regarding the concept embodied in the preambular paragraph that calls for effective national capacities for verification and enforcement, since we believe that verification

capacities and enforcement relate to international organizations created by relevant treaty regimes and do not lie with individual States.

The draft resolution also refers to compliance enforcement, which we believe relates to each relevant disarmament and arms control agreement, and the system, if any, that it establishes to follow up on the issue of compliance. We do not acknowledge the right of one or more States to enforce the compliance of another State. The appropriate framework remains the relevant United Nations institutions and the authority and mechanisms provided for by the relevant agreements.

Additionally, paragraph 7 calls for concerted action to encourage compliance and to hold those States not in compliance with such agreements accountable for that non-compliance in a manner consistent with the Charter of the United Nations. It is not clear which means are foreseen or which mechanisms are prescribed. A similar concern relates to paragraph 9, the language of which addresses taking action on non-compliance but is not restricted to intergovernmental outcomes of the United Nations and other international organizations.

Egypt had provided concrete language that underscored the urgency of achieving the universality of multilateral disarmament and non-proliferation agreements, in particular the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, as the cornerstone of the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime. The current draft resolution misses this most relevant aspect of universalization, which is the cornerstone for obligations and commitments related to disarmament and non-proliferation, which drove Egypt to continue to abstain on this draft resolution.

Mr. Luque Márquez (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I wish to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, on which Ecuador abstained. The delegation of Ecuador expresses its full respect for and compliance with the principles of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms limitation. In that regard, Ecuador is a signatory to all international instruments in the areas of weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons.

My delegation believes that draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments” — and in particular paragraph 7, which calls upon States to adopt bilateral or multilateral measures to encourage compliance and hold those not

in compliance with such agreements accountable for their non-compliance — paves the way for significant misinterpretations and could be interpreted as an endorsement of unilateral means and sanctions with extraterritorial application that have been condemned by Ecuador because they run counter to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. In addition, given that disarmament, non-proliferation and arms limitation instruments need to be universal if they are to be fully effective, we regret that the text of the draft resolution does not include a call for their universalization.

Consequently, while it abstained in the voting on the draft resolution, Ecuador recalls the existence of pending commitments and obligations in the context of nuclear disarmament and hopes that in the future the assessments of compliance and non-compliance with disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control obligations will be carried out on an equal footing for all States without distinction. The same level of effort should be made in following up on real or supposed failures of compliance in the framework of non-proliferation as is made to redress non-compliance with obligations under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Mr. Varma (India): India would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”. India voted in favour of the draft resolution since it believes in the responsibility of States to fully comply with the obligations undertaken in the various disarmament, non-proliferation and arms limitation agreements to which they are a party. Commitments of States also arise from obligations that they have undertaken voluntarily and in exercise of their sovereignty.

We believe that States, in encouraging compliance by other States with disarmament, non-proliferation and arms limitation agreements to which they are parties, or in pursuing appropriate areas of cooperation to increase confidence and compliance, should act in accordance with the compliance mechanisms and other provisions in the relevant agreements and in a manner consistent with the Charter of the United Nations and international law. Similarly, they should also resolve any issues relating to compliance by a State with its obligations in respect of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms limitation agreements to which it is a party in accordance with the compliance mechanisms provided

in the relevant agreements and in a manner consistent with the Charter of the United Nations and international law.

We would also like to emphasize the importance of multilateralism in addressing issues that may arise in relation to non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments. Further, it is also our understanding that other agreed obligations imply only those obligations that have been undertaken by States voluntarily and in exercise of their sovereignty.

Mr. Lindell (Sweden): I have the honour to take the floor in order to explain Sweden’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.43, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”. Sweden is not opposed to further research in this area, in particular as regards possible long-term environmental effects of depleted uranium, and appreciates this issue being discussed in the forum of the United Nations. Therefore, Sweden voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Having said this, Sweden notes that the potential harmful effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium on human health and the environment, as alluded to in the tenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, have not been substantiated by conclusive scientific evidence — a view supported by research conducted by Sweden, as well as by the United Nations Environment Programme, the World Health Organization and the International Atomic Energy Agency in a study provided to Member States by the Secretary-General. We would have preferred the draft resolution to point to the outcome of research conducted so far, not least under the auspices of the United Nations family.

We will closely monitor the outcome of ongoing and future research in this field and take any further developments into consideration as this issue is taken up again at the 2016 session of the First Committee.

Ms. Saggese (United Kingdom): I should like to deliver the following explanation of position on behalf of France and the United Kingdom, who joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.41, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”.

We wish to make clear that France and the United Kingdom operate under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities,

including the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. We see no direct connection, as stated in this draft resolution, between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control.

I should now like to deliver an explanation of position on behalf of France and the United Kingdom on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.42, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". France and the United Kingdom have joined the consensus on this draft resolution. We support the mainstreaming of disarmament issues in development policy, particularly in the field of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration.

That said, we feel it necessary to make our position clear on other aspects of this text. The notion of a symbiotic relationship between disarmament and development appears questionable to us as the conditions conducive to disarmament are not necessarily dependent on development only, as seen with the growing military expenditure of some developing countries. There is no automatic link between the two but rather a complex relationship that this notion does not accurately capture. Moreover, the idea according to which military expenditure directly diverts funding from development requirements would need to be nuanced, as defence investments are also necessary to develop peacekeeping, improve response to natural disasters, airborne and maritime equipment, and, under certain conditions, favour stability.

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

Mr. Ammar (Pakistan): I have asked for the floor to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments". My delegation abstained in the voting on this draft resolution. The earlier consensus on this text has broken down due to the deletion of significant language from the previous text by the sponsors.

More importantly, we believe that such a draft resolution must have universal application and not become a selective tool for targeting some countries. We say that because even some of the sponsors of the draft resolution are in violation of their own

commitments to non-proliferation and disarmament by pursuing policies of exceptionalism, discrimination and selectivity to further their political and commercial interests at the cost of their obligations under the international non-proliferation regime. Therefore, we expect them to practise what they preach.

Mr. Sousa Neto (Brazil): I have asked for the floor to explain Brazil's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45. The Brazilian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments", because it believes that, in order to eradicate weapons of mass destruction, the relevant agreements on disarmament and non-proliferation should be fully implemented and complied with by all Member States, as urged in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

Compliance with these treaties must not be selective. As we approach the end of another review cycle of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), Brazil would like to reiterate the importance of full compliance with article VI of the Treaty. It is our view that the compliance deficit in this regard harms the integrity of the NPT regime and jeopardizes the success achieved in the non-proliferation area.

Moreover, effective verification mechanisms constitute an essential aspect of compliance with relevant disarmament and non-proliferation agreements. Although the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution recognizes that verification and compliance are integrally related, Brazil believes that the draft could have benefited from broader language in regard to the importance of verification mechanisms to non-proliferation and disarmament agreements.

We take this opportunity to express our regret that some States parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction are still not in a position to resume negotiations on a universal, legally binding and non-discriminatory verification protocol.

Finally, with respect to paragraph 6, my delegation would have preferred the language of resolution 66/49, which sustained the view that the United Nations should play an active role in fostering negotiations on disarmament and non-proliferation agreements.

Mr. Ibrahim (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft

resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”. My delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution for the following reasons.

First, my delegation endorses compliance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and disarmament and other obligations related to these agreements, which are very important but require that compliance first and foremost be in line with international non-proliferation agreements, primarily the NPT, which is not complied with by some of the sponsors.

Secondly, the draft resolution calls for compliance with non-proliferation, disarmament and arms control treaties, while Israel, the only country in the Middle East which has nuclear weapons and refuses to join the NPT, has a nuclear arsenal that endangers peace and security throughout the Middle East and the world. Israel’s sponsorship of the draft resolution raises many question marks about its credibility, especially as one paragraph calls on all countries to hold those not in compliance with such agreements accountable. Everyone knows that Israel is the most flagrant example of non-compliance, and yet some States Members of the Organization continue to openly disregard its violations.

Thirdly, the draft resolution makes no mention at all of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) or the Conference on Disarmament, which gives the text a lack of logical balance, which would presuppose harmony between the activities of the United Nations, the IAEA and the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. Van der Kwast (Netherlands): I should like to make an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.43. The Netherlands has again voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.43, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”. However, the Netherlands regrets that the relevant United Nations Environment Programme report from 2010 (A/65/129/Add.1) is cited in a selective way in the draft resolution. That report also stated that measurements taken at the depleted uranium sites showed that even in areas with widespread depleted uranium contamination, the overall levels of radioactivity were low and within acceptable international standards, with no immediate dangers from either particle-based or waterborne toxicity.

Furthermore, we feel that key words in the draft resolution should have been formulated in a more neutral way. Instead of using the terms “potential long-term effects” or “potential hazards” or “potential harmful effects”, the more neutral term “possible consequences” would have been preferable. The reference in the draft resolution to the potential harmful effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium on human health and the environment cannot be supported by conclusive scientific evidence, a view that is shared by the World Health Organization and the International Atomic Energy Agency in the report of the Secretary-General.

Nevertheless, since scientific uncertainties regarding the possible consequences of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium persist, and taking into account the aforementioned explanation of our vote, the Netherlands supports the call for a precautionary approach to the use of depleted uranium. We will closely monitor the outcome of ongoing and future research in this field and take any further developments into consideration when this issue is taken up again during the 2016 session of this Committee.

Mr. Bravaco (United States of America): The United States did not participate in action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.41, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”. The United States operates under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. We see no direct connection, as stated in this draft resolution, between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control, and do not consider this a matter germane to the First Committee.

The United States did not participate in the Committee’s action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.42, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”. My Government believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues. Accordingly, we do not consider ourselves bound by the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development that was adopted in September 1987.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to explain the position of my delegation with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”.

As a principled position, the Islamic Republic of Iran is of the strong belief that all States should comply, on a non-discriminatory basis, with their obligations under all provisions of the treaties to which they are a party. On the merits of the content of this draft resolution, we are satisfied that it makes a reference to the concept of compliance as a contribution to efforts in preventing the development of weapons of mass destruction.

Paragraph 8 of the draft resolution urges those States not currently in compliance with their respective obligations and commitments to make the strategic decision to come back into compliance. We fully support this demand and in this context call on those nuclear-weapon States that are among the sponsors of this draft resolution and are not currently in compliance with their respective nuclear disarmament obligations under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to move beyond rhetoric and words and make a strategic decision to take effective and systematic actions towards the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals, in order to prevent further damage to international security and stability arising from their continued non-compliance with their nuclear disarmament obligations.

We have some principled reservations with regard to the substance of this draft resolution, including the following. First, while nuclear disarmament is the highest priority for the international community in the disarmament area, the text fails to accord priority to compliance with nuclear disarmament obligations and commitments.

Secondly, the central role of international organizations such as the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and the International Atomic Energy Agency, which are responsible for the verification of compliance by States parties to the disarmament and non-proliferation instruments in accordance with the procedures defined in those agreements, is overlooked.

Thirdly, consultations and cooperation among States parties to their relevant instruments in resolving their concerns with regard to compliance as well as on implementation in accordance with the procedures defined in those treaties are essential in promoting multilateralism and full and effective implementation of such instruments. Regrettably, this fundamental principle has been totally ignored in the draft resolution.

Fourthly, compliance is a very important legal issue. Therefore precision and clarity are needed for any text dealing with this sensitive question. The content of the draft resolution lacks such quality. None of the internationally agreed texts are included in the draft resolution.

Fifthly, we do not agree with an approach that supports national technical means for verification, compliance and enforcement. Such an approach, which tends to be implemented on the basis of politically motivated assumptions, would lead to resorting to unilateralism and would undermine the multilaterally agreed verification mechanisms.

Finally, it is paradoxical that a regime that is not a party to any international instruments banning weapons of mass destruction and continues to develop all kinds of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East region, is included in the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45, which urges States Members of the United Nations to comply with such instruments. That has only tarnished the standing of the draft resolution. For these reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.45.

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

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.28, entitled “Regional disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.28 was introduced by the representative of Pakistan. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.28 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.4.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.28 have expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.28 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.29, entitled “Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.29 was introduced by the representative of Pakistan. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.29 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.4. In addition, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has become a sponsor.

The Chair: The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.29 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.30, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.30 was introduced by the representative of Pakistan. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.30 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.4.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2. I shall therefore put that paragraph to the vote first.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal,

Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bhutan, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, San Marino, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 137 votes to 1, with 33 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.30 as a whole.

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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras,

Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), 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, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, 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, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.30, as a whole, was adopted by 170 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair: I now call on those representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Varma (India): We would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.30, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels". India voted against the draft resolution, as well as its paragraph 2, which requests the Conference on Disarmament to consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control.

In our view, the Conference on Disarmament, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has a vocation of negotiating disarmament

instruments of global application. In 1993, the United Nations Disarmament Commission adopted by consensus guidelines and recommendations for regional disarmament. There is no need, therefore, for the Conference on Disarmament to engage itself in formulating principles on the same subject at a time when it has several other priority issues on its agenda.

Further, we believe that the security concerns of States extend beyond narrowly defined regions. Consequently, the notion of the preservation of a balance of difference capabilities in the regional or subregional context is unreasonable, unrealistic and unacceptable to our delegation.

The Chair: The Committee will now turn to the draft resolutions and decisions listed under cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

I now give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions under this cluster.

Mr. El Oumni (Morocco): The achievement of a world free of nuclear weapons requires the political will of all and revitalized disarmament machinery. In this regard, we call on all members of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) to show flexibility and to allow that negotiating forum to start substantive work, including on nuclear disarmament.

Morocco supports the expansion of the CD and understands the interests of many States. This issue should, however, be handled with care. We remain convinced of the relevance of the United Nations Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body. We share concern at the incapacity of the Disarmament Commission to reach agreement on any recommendations since 1999. The Commission can, as it has in the past, arrive at agreed recommendations. We believe, however, that one way forward would be focused deliberations. As draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.51 calls for, the agenda of the next cycle should provide for such focused deliberations.

Ms. Vladulescu (Romania), Vice-Chair, took the Chair.

Even without changing its agenda, during the informal deliberations conducted by the Chair of the Commission, the Permanent Representative of Croatia, our delegation made several proposals aimed at facilitating a successful new cycle. We will continue engaging actively and constructively in the work of the

Commission as well as in the discussions on means of improving its effectiveness.

There is also room for improving the work of the First Committee. Our delegation calls in particular for considering the possibility of making resolutions biennial or triennial and further reviewing the organization of the work of the Committee. Morocco welcomes the participation of civil society in the work of the First Committee. In this regard, we welcome the Chair's proposal to allow representatives of civil society to make their statements after the closure of the general debate. We encourage the Chair to conduct further consultations on all these issues and remain ready to contribute to such discussions.

I should like to close by reiterating our commitment to the disarmament machinery and cautioning against measures that might jeopardize its integrity and mandate.

Mr. Mendi (South Africa): I am taking the floor on behalf of the Netherlands, Switzerland and South Africa on draft decision A/C.1/69/L.19, entitled "Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations".

At the sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly, Switzerland, South Africa and the Netherlands introduced a draft resolution on revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations. The draft was adopted by consensus by this Committee and subsequently the General Assembly as resolution 66/66. That resolution was informed by the range of concerns expressed by the international community regarding the lack of progress in the relevant disarmament forums. Its main aim was to unite all States Members of the United Nations around the need to revitalize the work of the multilateral disarmament machinery, including the Conference on Disarmament (CD), and to take forward multilateral disarmament negotiations. In the resolution, States were encouraged to build on the work that had already been undertaken and to explore, consider and consolidate options, proposals and elements for revitalization.

Taking note of the discussions on the revitalization of the Conference that have taken place in the CD and of the different initiatives being pursued in the First Committee that were directly or indirectly related to the work of the CD, the authors of resolution 66/66 have elected to introduce since the sixty-sixth session of the

First Committee of the General Assembly, a decision to include this item on the agenda for its yearly session.

We have noted some encouraging developments regarding the revitalization of the work of the CD reflecting the growing importance that States Members of the United Nations accord to this issue. That was illustrated in 2013 by the continuation and deepening of discussions on the revitalization of the CD or the decision to establish an informal working group to produce a programme of work, robust in substance and progressive over time, a body re-established in 2014.

It is also demonstrated this year by the decision to hold structured and substantive discussions on all the items on the CD agenda, or by the significant suggestions made with a view to improving the effective functioning of the CD, including by its Acting Secretary-General, on the establishment of a subsidiary body to examine and make proposals on the working methods of the CD and on enhancing engagement with civil society. We urge CD members to intensify their efforts to take the revitalization process forward in 2015.

We are also encouraged by the advancement of a number of initiatives related to nuclear disarmament, such as the growing concern expressed by States about the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons. These initiatives give new impetus towards the achievement and maintenance of a nuclear-weapon-free world and as such only serve to strengthen the work of the CD.

The Chair returned to the Chair.

Notwithstanding these encouraging developments, it is clear that much more remains to be done. We see an urgent need to intensify further efforts to revitalize the work of the CD and the United Nations disarmament machinery. The current deadlock has prevented the CD for too long from fulfilling its task, in particular from taking forward nuclear disarmament, serving to undermine its credibility, and it is our hope that the initiatives I referred to will be taken forward.

As the authors of resolution 66/66, we have carefully considered these various developments. We have decided not to submit a follow-up draft resolution at this year's session but to introduce a decision, including this item on the agenda of the seventieth session of the First Committee. We will closely monitor progress towards the revitalization of the CD and United Nations disarmament machinery as we will take stock

of progress made in taking multilateral disarmament forward, in particular nuclear disarmament. We will continue to advocate for progress towards this end and stand ready to engage with all delegations on revisiting the implementation of resolution 66/66 next year.

Mr. Drobnyak (Croatia): I take the floor in order to introduce a draft resolution on the report of the Disarmament Commission. Therefore I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.51, entitled “Report of the Disarmament Commission”, on behalf of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) Bureau.

The proposed text has been drafted in the spirit of the consensus-based work of the UNDC with the goal of being adopted by consensus. It contains all the elements from previous resolutions on the matter but is more than a roll-over. It also encourages the revitalization of the work of the UNDC, keeping in mind the fact that the Commission had not been able to submit any substantive recommendations to the General Assembly in the course of the past 15 years.

The draft resolution is trying to set the scene for the next triennial cycle, and in particular for the 2015 substantive session, emphasizing the need for a focus and results-oriented discussion on the agenda items. The draft resolution, *inter alia*, recommends that the UNDC intensify consultations with a view to reaching agreement on the items on its agenda, keeping in mind the proposal to include a third agenda item, and also encourages the UNDC to invite, as appropriate, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research to prepare background papers on the agenda items and if need be other disarmament experts to present their views upon the invitation by the Chair and the prior approval of the UNDC.

The proposed draft resolution paves the way for a more efficient working of the UNDC and is made with the clear goal of contributing to enhancing the relevance and credibility of the UNDC as an important part of the United Nations disarmament machinery. The draft resolution, I repeat, has been drafted with the clear view of being adopted by consensus. I thank all delegations and colleagues who contributed to this text and who participated in the informals.

Ms. Del Sol Dominguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba fully supports and is a sponsor of draft decision A/C.1/69/L.37, entitled “Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly

Devoted to Disarmament”, which was introduced by the Non-Aligned Movement. We support the holding in 2015, preferably around the middle of the year, of the organizational session of the Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament with the aim of setting a date for its substantive sessions in 2015 and 2016. According to resolution 65/66, the Working Group will 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.

This draft decision is important not only for the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement, but also for the international community as a whole. It responds to the call for efforts to optimize the United Nations disarmament machinery. The holding of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should not continue to be postponed.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.40, Cuba supports the work and revitalization of the regional centres for peace and disarmament, and calls attention to the work of the centres to inform and educate the public and to obtain support for the objectives of United Nations disarmament initiatives, as well as development and the promotion of a culture of peace. We also recognize that many States have benefited from the assistance provided by the regional centres in their endeavour to contribute to building understanding and cooperation among States in each region in the area of peace, disarmament and development.

The Chair: I call on the observer of the European Union.

Mr. Kos (European Union): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine and the United States align themselves with this statement.

I should like to make some observations regarding draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.51, entitled “Report of the Disarmament Commission”. The European Union has always recognized the important role that the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) was designed to play as the main subsidiary body of the General Assembly on disarmament matters, established by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It played an important role

in the past by adopting a number of guidelines and recommendations.

Regrettably, since 1999 the UNDC has not been able to fulfil its mandate properly and failed to agree on any recommendations. The EU believes that our approach on possible ways forward should be consistent with decision 52/492, adopted by the General Assembly in 1998. It provides some flexibility regarding the substantive agenda of the Disarmament Commission, in particular the possibility of including a third agenda item. That option seems to be worth exploring. An additional agenda item may create favourable conditions for overcoming the existing deadlock caused by artificial linkages between the results of proceedings in two working groups, as we witnessed during the latest three-year cycle. It would also allow the UNDC to discuss new developments in the field of international security and multilateral disarmament.

Since this session will mark the beginning of a new three-year cycle, we sincerely hope that the UNDC will grasp this opportunity to agree on a more focused agenda. These agenda items are meant to provide further room for consensual UNDC recommendations that would allow the UNDC again to play the important role it was designed for. We look forward to working with other delegations to turn the upcoming three-year cycle into a productive one for the UNDC.

Mr. Zelený (Czech Republic): I am speaking on behalf of the informal group of observer States to the Conference on Disarmament, whose members are Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, the Holy See, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Nepal, Oman, the Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovenia, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Arab Emirates and Uruguay. I am pleased also to speak on behalf of the following countries: Angola, Austria, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Finland, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Mexico, New Zealand, Romania, Spain, Sweden and Ukraine.

As the General Assembly proceeds to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.8, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", on which we will join

the consensus, I should like to deliver the following explanation of position.

During the preceding negotiations of the draft resolution in Geneva, the position of the informal group, further joined by some Conference on Disarmament (CD) members, was determined by previous steps taken by the Conference on Disarmament. After a forward-looking proposal made by the CD President in June, the Ambassador of Albania was appointed as Friend of the CD President on the enlargement at the CD plenary meeting of 17 June 2014. With the hope arising from this positive step, we saw great value in mentioning the development and in reflecting on this year's progress in the 2014 CD report. In our view, this was justified by the mere fact that the issue of consultations on expansion is addressed in the rules of procedure. Subsequently, we requested that this be adequately reflected in the text of the draft resolution that is now being adopted. It is unfortunate that such an effectual reference has not been made in either of these documents.

It is well known that the fundamental aspiration of the informal group is the expansion of the membership of the Conference, which is not only essential to the CD but also of importance to the international community as a whole. The consultations on this question have been going on for a decade. It has been more than 14 years since action was taken on the issue of enlargement. We believe that expansion would help to regain the credibility of the Conference by transforming it into a universally represented body. At the same time it should enable all States Members of the United Nations to be granted the equal possibility of participating as fully fledged members in disarmament negotiations and to share the common responsibility of achieving disarmament goals.

We consider that international stability and security with respect to disarmament is by definition a universal question and must be addressed by a universally represented body. It is thereby unsound that a limited group of States is taking decisions on universal questions. That is why we take the floor today to reiterate our position on this matter.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions and decisions under cluster 7.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.8, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.8 was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the Committee's 10th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsor is named in document A/C.1/69/L.8.

In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the General Assembly rules of procedure. Under the terms of operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.8, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to ensure and to strengthen, if needed, the provision to the Conference on Disarmament of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services. It is recalled that resources for the substantive and secretariat support of the Conference on Disarmament are included under section 4, Disarmament, and that the resources for conference servicing are included under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and conference management, of the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

Subject to decisions taken at the 2015 session of the Conference on Disarmament to establish its programme of work for 2015 and to establish any subsidiary bodies for its implementation, the strengthening of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services to the Conference, as requested in operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, may entail additional resource requirements under the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015. The established procedures on the preparation of a statement of programme budget implications would be followed, as necessary, in the context of actions taken by the Conference on Disarmament.

At this time, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.8 would not give rise to any programme budget implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.8 has expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.8 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.9, entitled

“United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.9 was introduced by the representative of Nepal at the Committee's 10th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.9 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.4. In addition the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has become a sponsor.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.9 have expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.9 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/69/L.19, entitled “Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/69/L.19 was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the Committee's 10th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/69/L.19.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/69/L.19 have expressed the wish that it 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 decision A/C.1/69/L.19 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/69/L.37, entitled “Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/69/L.37 was introduced 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. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/69/L.37. In addition, the following oral statement is made in

accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of operative paragraph (a) of the draft decision, the General Assembly, recalling its resolution 65/66, of 8 December 2010, and its decision 67/518, of 3 December 2012, 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 2015 and 2016, and submit a report on its work, including possible substantive recommendations, before the end of the seventy-first session of the General Assembly.

Pursuant to the request contained in operative paragraph (a) of the draft decision, it is envisaged that the Open-ended Working Group would hold in New York: (a) one organizational session, that is, one meeting in 2015; (b) one substantive session of five days' duration, for a total of 10 meetings in 2015; (c) one organizational session, that is, one meeting in 2016; and (d) one substantive session of five days' duration, for a total of 10 meetings in 2016. The aforementioned meetings would require interpretation in all six languages and would constitute an addition to the meetings workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management.

Furthermore, it is anticipated that the request contained in paragraph (b) for documentation would constitute an addition to the documentation workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management of a total of eight documents — two pre-session, five in-session, and one post-session) in 2015 and 11 documents — two pre-session, seven in-session and two post-session — in 2016, to be issued in all six languages.

The provisions for 2015 to service the organizational meeting and the meetings of the Open-ended Working Group including documentation have been included under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management", of the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015. The resource requirements for 2016 in the amount of \$357,300 for meetings and documentation will be included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft decision A/C.1/69/L.37, no additional requirements would arise under the programme

budget for the biennium 2014-2015. The additional requirements for 2016 in the amount of \$357,300 will be included under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, 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, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan,

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.1/69/L.37 was adopted by 169 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.40, entitled “United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.40 was introduced 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. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in A/C.1/69/L.40. In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.40, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide all support necessary, within existing resources, to the regional centres in carrying out their programmes of activities. The implementation of the request would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, Disarmament, of the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015. The provision contained therein covers the three Director posts (P-5), the three Political Affairs Officers (P-3) and three General Service Administrative Assistants (GS-7) of the Regional Centres, and also includes general operating costs of the Centres. The programmes of activities of the three Regional Centres would continue to be financed from extra budgetary resources.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.40, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

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 latest of which is resolution 68/246, of 27 December 2013, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters; and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.40 have expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.40 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.51, entitled “Report of the Disarmament Commission”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.51 was just introduced by the representative of Croatia. The sponsor of the draft resolution is named in draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.51.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.51 has expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.51 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.55/Rev.1, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.55/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Peru at the Committee’s 10th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is named in document A/C.1/69/L.55/Rev.1.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.55/Rev.1 has expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.55/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.58, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security questions in Central Africa”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.58 was introduced by the representative of Equatorial Guinea on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Economic Community of Central African States at the Committee’s 14th meeting, on 22nd October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/69/L.58.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.58 have expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.58 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.59, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.59 was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the Committee’s 14th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.59 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.4. In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 10 and 11 of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.59, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to facilitate close cooperation between the Regional Centre and the African Union, in particular in the areas of disarmament, peace and security; and also request the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Regional Centre with the support necessary for greater achievements and results. The implementation of the request contained in paragraph 10 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

Regarding paragraph 11, the provision under section 4, Disarmament, of the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 covers two international posts (P-5 and P-3) and one General Staff/Local level post (GS-7), and also includes general operating expenses. The programme activities of the Regional Centre would continue to be financed from extra-budgetary resources.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.59, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.59 have expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.59 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.61, entitled “United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.61 was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the Committee’s 18th meeting, on 27 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.61 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.4. In addition, Colombia has become a sponsor.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.61 have expressed the wish that it 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.1/69/L.61 was adopted.

The Chair: I now call on those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Herraiz (Spain): I have the honour to deliver an explanation of vote on draft decision A/C.1/69/L.37, entitled “Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament”, on behalf of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania,

Portugal, Romania and my own country, Spain, introduced at the present session by Indonesia.

Our decision is based on the conviction that the United Nations disarmament machinery needs serious attention and political impulse geared 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.1/69/L.37, 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 would also 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 and that there are no extrabudgetary implications for the current budget of 2014-2015 or for the following biennium.

Mr. Bergemann (United States of America): I am taking the floor on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States to explain our delegations' abstentions in the voting on the draft decision contained in A/C.1/69/L.37, entitled "Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament". The draft decision is based on the provisions of General Assembly resolution 65/66, on which our three delegations abstained in the voting on budgetary and substantive grounds. These reasons remain valid and therefore our delegations decided to maintain our abstentions.

Mr. Biontino (Germany): I should like to give an explanation of vote on draft decision A/C.1/69/L.37, entitled "Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament". Bulgaria, Finland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Sweden and my own country voted in favour of the draft decision, as we did in 2012. Our decision continues to be based on the conviction that the United Nations disarmament machinery urgently needs political impulses towards revitalization and the resumption of the main tasks involved in negotiating multilateral instruments in the field of disarmament.

It is against this backdrop that we voted in favour of the draft decision, which aims at starting the implementation of resolution 65/66 by holding at a later stage an organizational session of the Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament. In this

context, we would like to point out that we also support draft decision A/C.1/69/L.20, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", and draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.21, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations". These draft resolutions in our view include complementary efforts to revitalize the multilateral disarmament machinery.

We would like to stress, however, that the pursuit of the fourth special session is neither an alternative nor a reason to postpone efforts to overcome the stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament and implementing relevant disarmament and non-proliferation commitments, notably the action plan of 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, if any, 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. Furthermore, we expect the secretariat of the Office for Disarmament Affairs not to bring forward budget implications for the budget 2014-2015 in that context. Should the Open-ended Working Group convene at a later point in time, the same would apply to the following budget negotiations.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation joined the consensus in adopting draft resolutions on the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, and the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa, as contained in documents A/C.1/69/L.55/Rev.1, A/C.1/69/L.59 and A/C.1/69/L.58, respectively, based on the understanding that all measures, references and concepts contained in such resolutions are applicable only to the countries in the concerned regions.

My delegation, while disassociating itself from any reference in those draft resolutions to ammunition and explosives, armed violence, the Arms Trade Treaty and Security Council resolution 1325 (2000), would like to put on record that these references should not set a precedent for their inclusion in future in other resolutions and decisions of the First Committee, or the scope of the issue or outcome documents of other

disarmament forums such as the meetings related to the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

The Chair: The Committee will now turn to the draft resolutions and decisions listed under cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons” in informal paper 3.

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

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to introduce, on behalf of Egypt, Indonesia and my own delegation, the draft decision entitled “Missiles”, contained in document A/C.1/69/L.24. The draft decision has been prepared and submitted in line with the position of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM).

In the final document of the Seventeenth Ministerial Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Algiers in May, the Ministers reaffirmed the need for a multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive, transparent and non-discriminatory approach towards the issue of missiles in all its aspects, as a contribution to international peace and security. They expressed their support for efforts to be continued within the United Nations to explore further the issue of missiles in all its aspects. They also emphasized the need to keep the issue of missiles in all its aspects on the agenda of the General Assembly. Draft decision A/C.1/69/L.24 seeks to include the issue of missiles on the agenda of the seventy-first session of the General Assembly. We hope that the draft decision again will be adopted by consensus.

The Chair: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position before voting on the draft resolutions and decisions listed under cluster 1.

Ms. Del Sol Dominguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As it has done on previous occasions, Cuba will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.25, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”.

The Code was drafted and adopted in a process that occurred outside the framework of the United Nations and in which not all interested countries participated. Cuba believes that the issue of missiles in all their aspects can and should be considered within the framework of the United Nations in a manner that is inclusive,

transparent, non-selective and non-discriminatory. All interested Member States have the legitimate right to openly and fully participate in all stages of consideration of the issue and in the adoption of practical measures in that regard. The Code of Conduct contains significant shortcomings and limitations and does not adequately reflect the legitimate interests of a significant group of countries. Those problems include the following.

First, the Code addresses neither the issue of the peaceful use of missile technology, nor the need for cooperation in this area to address the specific interests of developing countries.

Secondly, the focus of the Code is limited to horizontal proliferation and ignores vertical proliferation. Cuba believes that the comprehensive, balanced and non-discriminatory treatment of the issue of missiles also requires the inclusion of significant and important aspects of vertical proliferation, such as the design, development, testing and deployment of missiles.

Thirdly, the Code disregards the most serious problem, which is the existence and ongoing development of nuclear weapons, of which ballistic missiles are a delivery system.

Fourthly, the Code refers to ballistic missiles but not to other types of missiles that are also relevant.

Fifthly, the Code omits references to assistance and cooperation, which must be taken into account in order properly to address the issue of missiles.

Cuba is fully committed to the prohibition and elimination of weapons of mass destruction and to strict control of their delivery systems, including missiles. We are convinced that legally binding instruments that are negotiated multilaterally in an inclusive and transparent manner are the best and the only truly effective mechanisms to address disarmament and non-proliferation matters, including the proliferation of ballistic missiles.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions and decisions under cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”.

The Committee will now take action on draft decision A/C.1/69/L.24, entitled “Missiles”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/69/L.24 was just introduced by the

representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/69/L.24.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft decision A/C.1/69/L.24 has expressed the wish that it 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 decision A/C.1/69/L.24 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.25, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.25 was introduced by the representative of Peru. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in A/C.1/69/L.25 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.5. In addition, Malta, Tajikistan and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia have become sponsors.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, 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, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, 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, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New

Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, 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, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Brazil, China, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.25 was adopted by 152 votes to 1, with 19 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.49, entitled “Mongolia’s international security and nuclear-weapon-free status”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.49 was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the Committee’s 19th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.49 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.5. In addition, Montenegro has become a sponsor.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.49 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.56, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.56 was introduced by the representative of Mexico. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.56 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.5. In addition, Argentina, the Bahamas and Guyana have become sponsors.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph. I shall put that paragraph to the vote first.

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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, 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, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic,

Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, 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, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Israel, Mauritius, Pakistan

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 167 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.56 as a whole.

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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), 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, Mauritania, 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, Rwanda,

Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, 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, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

India, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.56, as a whole, was adopted by 170 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.60, entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.60 was introduced by the representative of Nigeria. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.60 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.5. In addition, Ecuador has become a sponsor.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.60 was adopted.

The Chair: I now call on those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Varma (India): I should like to explain India's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.25, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation". My delegation 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 affected 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, which continue.

This complexity demands that any initiative to address concerns relating to ballistic missile proliferation be inclusive, sustainable and comprehensive. We welcome the fact that the last Group of Governmental Experts on missiles in all its aspects, which had among its members the representatives of several of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.25, emphasized in its report (A/63/176) the important role of the United Nations in providing a more structured and effective mechanism to build consensus.

We acknowledge that 137 States consider The Hague Code of Conduct to be a practical confidence-building and transparency measure. Although India is not a member of The Hague Code of Conduct, we are willing to study it in the context of assurances that membership of the Code 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's guidelines on exercising maximum restraint on such activities. In this respect, India hosted a Hague Code of Conduct team in New Delhi in September last year for consultations. India remains open to further engagement with The Hague Code of Conduct.

I now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.49, entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status". As a country that maintains friendly and fraternal ties with Mongolia, India welcomes the adoption without a vote of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.49 on Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status. We note the many steps Mongolia has taken to reinforce the status and that it has received support and security assurances for such a status from Member States, particularly those possessing nuclear weapons. India fully respects the choice made by Mongolia and conveys its unambiguous assurance that it will respect Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.60, entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty", India respects the sovereign choice of non-nuclear-weapon States to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. That principle is consistent with the provisions of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and

the 1999 United Nations Disarmament Commission guidelines.

India enjoys friendly and mutually beneficial relations with countries of the African continent. India shares and supports African aspirations for enhancing the region's wellbeing and security. We respect the sovereign choice of States parties to the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty and welcome the successful entry into force of the Treaty. As a nuclear-weapon State, India conveys its unambiguous assurance that it will respect the status of the African nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Mr. Herraiz (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): Spain would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.60, entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty". The entry into force in 2009 of the Treaty of Pelindaba, creating a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, made a significant contribution to strengthening international peace and security and is of particular importance to all African countries. That is why Spain has always and unequivocally supported the objectives outlined in the Treaty of Pelindaba, and welcomes its entry into force.

Spain has close relations with the countries of Africa and has made significant efforts through its Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation to promote the sustainable development of them all. Spain stands ready to make the necessary efforts to ensure that the States parties to the Treaty of Pelindaba have the necessary capacities to implement its provisions.

After studying very carefully the invitation extended to Spain to become a party to Protocol III of the Treaty of Pelindaba, after consultations with Parliament, and taking into account the guidelines that were adopted by consensus by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session on the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones through arrangements freely entered into among States of the region, my Government decided not to sign the Protocol, and so indicated to the depositary of the Treaty at the time.

I should like to highlight only two issues here. First, the Treaty of Pelindaba does not contain any provision, obligation or safeguard with regard to disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation that Spain has not already adopted to cover its entire national territory. By virtue of its adherence to various international arrangements, Spain has undertaken a series of obligations and

safeguards in the context of the European Atomic Energy Community and its Safeguards Agreement under the Additional Protocol that it has signed with the International Atomic Energy Agency, which go far beyond the provisions of the Treaty of Pelindaba.

Secondly, the entire territory of Spain has been fully denuclearized since 1976. This prohibition on the introduction, installation or stockpiling of nuclear weapons in the territory of Spain was reaffirmed by Parliament when Spain became a member of NATO in 1981 and approved in a consultative referendum held in March 1986. As a result, Spain has already taken all the necessary measures to ensure that the Treaty of Pelindaba is applicable throughout its national territory.

Spain has joined the consensus on this draft resolution of the First Committee since it was first introduced in 1997. Nevertheless, the delegation of Spain does not consider itself bound by the consensus on paragraph 5. It has been working with other delegations to find a more balanced text that would be acceptable to all parties and believes that the discussion on the draft resolution could lead to satisfactory results in future sessions.

Mr. Aljowaily (Egypt): I take the floor to explain Egypt's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.25. The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation is a product of export-control regimes developed outside the United Nations in a discriminatory manner.

Egypt believes that in addition to its voluntary 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. Furthermore, this year's draft resolution has seen the inclusion of additional language that we believe has the potential to restrict the rights of States to the peaceful uses of outer space. In conclusion, 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.

Mr. An Myong Hun (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea voted against draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.56, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-

Ban Treaty”, because the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea has rejected the Security Council resolutions, including resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009), referred to in the draft resolution. These resolutions are the products of the arbitrariness, coerciveness and double standards of the Security Council.

The nuclear war exercises of the United States targeting the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea take place every year in the southern part of the Korean peninsula, but the Security Council remains silent about them. When the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea conducts a nuclear test as a measure for strengthening self-defence capabilities, the United States terms it a threat to regional peace and stability.

In the history of humankind, it is the United States that has conducted more nuclear tests than any other country. The unique security situation on the Korean peninsula makes the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea take a serious approach to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. The delegation of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea is of the strong view that more attention should be paid to taking practical steps towards nuclear disarmament, which is also at the top of the Non-Aligned Movement’s disarmament agenda.

Mr. Ammar (Pakistan): I have requested the floor to explain my delegation’s votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/69/L.25, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”, and draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.56, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”.

First, on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.25, during the discussions that led to the evolution of The Hague Code of Conduct, Pakistan had 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 where 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 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. For these reasons my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

On draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.56, Pakistan has over the years consistently supported the objectives of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). Accordingly, we have voted in favour of this text in the past, and have done so this year as well. My delegation continues to believe that the objective of the call in the draft resolution for promoting signatures and ratifications leading to the CTBT’s entry into force will be facilitated when major erstwhile proponents of the CTBT decide to ratify it. Acceptance of the CTBT obligations on a regional basis in South Asia will also help to expedite its entry into force.

The draft resolution welcomes the conclusion and recommendations of the most recent Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We wish to reiterate that we do not consider ourselves bound by any of the provisions that emanate from NPT Review Conferences or any other forums in which Pakistan is not represented. Therefore, my delegation, while in the spirit of flexibility having voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.56 as a whole, was constrained to abstain in the voting on the sixth preambular paragraph.

Ms. Rahaminoff-Honig (Israel): Israel voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.56, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”, in the light of its long-standing support of the Treaty, which it signed in 1996. Despite Israel’s favourable attitude towards the Treaty, we were unfortunately unable to support the language contained in A/C.1/69/L.56 in its entirety, and in particular the sixth preambular paragraph and paragraph 1.

Although the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) both deal with issues pertaining to the nuclear domain, they are different in their obligations and membership. Therefore, decisions and resolutions taken in the context of one Treaty cannot be automatically transferred or imposed on States that have not subscribed to the other.

Since the establishment of the Preparatory Commission of the CTBT, Israel has actively participated in the development of all elements of the Treaty’s verification

regime. Israel transmits data from its certified seismic stations to the international data centre and actively participates in various activities related to the on-site inspections element. Israel's radionuclide laboratory has been certified recently by the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) and continues to expand its analytical capabilities. The extent of Israel's support and involvement in the substantive work of the CTBTO Preparatory Commission demonstrates the importance Israel attributes to this Treaty and to our recognition of its contribution to the enhancement of international peace and security.

For Israel, completion of the verification regime constitutes a major consideration for ratification. It is also a prerequisite for the entry into force of the Treaty. We appreciate the significant progress made in the development of the CTBT verification regime. However, its completion still requires further efforts. Major steps are still needed for the continued build-up and testing of the international monitoring system stations, the completion of the operational manual for on-site inspections, as well as equipment purchase and training. In this regard we commend the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the Provisional Technical Secretariat for the work done towards the successful conduct of the Integrated Field Exercise 2014 (IFE14). In the context of the upcoming exercise, Israel is pleased to be hosting the twenty-second on-site inspection workshop in April 2015.

The regional security situation in the Middle East, including adherence to and compliance with the Treaty by States in the region, is another major consideration for ratification for Israel. The Treaty's verification regime should be robust to detect non-compliance with its basic obligations, be immune to abuse, and at the same time allow each State signatory to protect its national security interests. Adequate coverage of the Middle East by the International Monitoring System is paramount. Regrettably, three Middle Eastern countries have yet to set up or operate national seismic stations and transfer data to the International Data Centre.

Another significant consideration for ratification is Israel's equal status in the policy-making organs of the Treaty's Organization. The 15-year paralysis in the Middle East and South Asia regional group, which is defined in annex I to the Treaty, must be remedied. All States must be allowed to participate in the work of the Treaty on an equal footing in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality.

Israel joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.60, entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty", in the light of its support for the principle that nuclear-weapon-free zones should emanate exclusively from a region, be agreed upon through consensus, and reflect arrangements freely arrived at by all States concerned. That position is based not just on a pragmatic and realistic approach but also reflects principles stipulated in the 1999 Disarmament Commission guidelines on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region.

We note with interest that the draft resolution calls upon African States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Treaty as soon as possible. This call is consonant with the 1996 Cairo Declaration adopted on the occasion of the signing of the Treaty of Pelindaba, which invites African States to ratify the Treaty as soon as possible.

We also note with interest that of those States that have not yet ratified the Pelindaba Treaty, some have been very vocal in calling for other States to join and establish a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East and continue to initiate one-sided resolutions that purport to single out States. It would seem logical that those States that have negotiated and adopted the Pelindaba Treaty would begin by implementing their own current, freely arrived at obligations rather than devoting all of their efforts towards unhelpful resolutions that, among other things, do not reflect developments on the ground.

Israel has not objected to draft decision A/C.1/69/L.24 despite finding it curious that one of the sponsors of this decision is heavily involved in the wholesale proliferation of rockets and missiles to States and terrorist organizations in the region of the Middle East. In addition, that same sponsor has been the subject of several Security Council resolutions that call on States, *inter alia* in paragraph 5 of Security Council resolution 1696 (2006),

"in accordance with their national legal authorities and legislation and consistent with international law, to exercise vigilance and prevent the transfer of any items, materials, goods and technology that could contribute to Iran's enrichment-related and reprocessing activities and ballistic missile programmes".

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.