



General Assembly

Sixty-ninth session

First Committee

10th meeting

Friday, 17 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)

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

The Chair: The Committee will begin this afternoon's thematic discussion by listening to the remaining speakers on the list for the "Disarmament machinery" cluster.

Delegations are reminded that the time limit for statements during the thematic segment is five minutes when speaking in a national capacity and seven minutes for statements on behalf of several delegations. We have 34 speakers on the list today, so I urge all delegations taking the floor kindly to adhere to the time limit to enable us to keep up with the timetable for this segment of our work.

I should like to remind the Committee that we are scheduled to conclude our discussion of the "Disarmament machinery" cluster today. I therefore urge all delegations that have inscribed their names to speak today to ensure that they are available to deliver their statements this afternoon. On Monday the Committee will move on to the "Nuclear weapons" cluster, in accordance with our indicative timetable for thematic discussions. Delegations taking the floor are also encouraged to use that opportunity to introduce draft resolutions and decisions where applicable.

Mr. Varma (India): We will of course heed your call, Sir, that we save as much time as possible. I will read some portions of a longer statement that we will circulate.

We associate ourselves with the statement that will be delivered by the Permanent Representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. Let me quickly go through India's positions.

We believe that the United Nations has a central role and the primary responsibility in the field of disarmament. The First Committee is the embodiment of the international community's faith in the benefit of multilateral approaches on disarmament and international security issues. We hope that it will act as a platform for building consensus for collective action on the disarmament agenda.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission is the only universal forum that provides for in-depth consideration of specific disarmament issues. Under the leadership of the Ambassador of Croatia, this year the Commission has made considerable progress in finding common ground on the two items on its agenda. It has also come close to reaching consensus, which unfortunately remained elusive. In our view, that was due more to the lack of the requisite political will than to a deficiency in the institutional mechanism of the Commission. We support efforts to reinvigorate the work of the Commission for the next triennial cycle.

The Conference on Disarmament (CD) continues to have the mandate, the membership, the credibility and the rules of procedure to discharge its responsibility

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>).

14-57500 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. India remains committed to efforts aimed at the CD reaching consensus on its programme of work. We share the disappointment that negotiations have not commenced, despite the efforts of the informal working Group established for that purpose. This year the Conference was able to engage in in-depth and extensive discussions on all items on its agenda. We also hope that the work of the Group of Governmental Experts on a Fissile Materials Cut-off Treaty, under the able leadership of Canada, will facilitate the early commencement of negotiations on such a treaty in the Conference on Disarmament on the basis of the agreed mandate.

The membership of various groups of governmental experts constituted by the Secretary-General has been the subject of some concern in the Committee. We regret that India, a major space-faring nation, was excluded from the Group of Governmental Experts on Transparency and Confidence-building Measures in Outer Space Activities. Despite having major capabilities in the field and having contributed actively to the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security in previous years, India was dropped from the Group of Governmental Experts this year.

The Secretariat, in particular the Office for Disarmament Affairs, has an important responsibility in assisting States in pursuing the multilateral disarmament agenda, and it should be strengthened. There is also a need to ensure greater coherence between disarmament work in New York and in Geneva.

The United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) and the Secretary-General's Advisory Board, which find their origins in the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, have an important supporting role. We believe that UNIDIR should be strengthened so that it can fulfil its role of providing in-depth and long-term research on disarmament issues. The Secretary-General's Advisory Board should be representative to enable an inclusive and forward-looking approach to global disarmament issues.

A longer statement has been circulated.

Mr. Percaya (Indonesia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM).

NAM remains concerned at the continuous erosion of multilateralism in the field of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. The Movement is determined to continue promoting multilateralism as the core principle of negotiations in those areas, and as the only sustainable approach to address those issues in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

NAM underscores the importance of multilateral disarmament machinery, which consists of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) as the sole multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament, the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) as a universal deliberative body and subsidiary organ of the General Assembly, and the First Committee. NAM stresses preserving and strengthening the nature, role and purpose of each part of that machinery.

Enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations disarmament machinery is a shared objective. Based on its existing rules of procedure and methods of work, this machinery has produced landmark treaties and guidelines. NAM believes that the main difficulty lies in the lack of political will by some States to make progress, particularly on nuclear disarmament.

NAM reiterates its call on the CD to agree on a balanced and comprehensive programme of work. While welcoming the efforts made during the 2014 session of the CD on its programme of work, pursuant to the CD decision set out in document CD/1974 to re-establish an informal working group, NAM notes the deliberations of the informal Working Group in its meetings during the CD's 2014 session. NAM also takes note of the structured informal discussions held during the CD's 2014 session on all its agenda items, in accordance with the schedule of activities set out in document CD/1978. The Movement encourages all States to demonstrate the necessary political will so that the CD fulfils its negotiating mandate.

To instil fresh impetus into global nuclear disarmament efforts, NAM calls for the urgent commencement of negotiations in the CD for the early conclusion of a comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons that prohibits their possession, development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use, and provides for their destruction, as called for in resolution 68/32, presented by the Movement.

With regard to the UNDC, NAM expresses regret that the Commission has been unable to reach

agreement on any recommendations since 2000 due to the lack of political will and the inflexible positions of some nuclear-weapon States, despite the Movement's constructive role and concrete proposals throughout the deliberations, especially in the Working Group on recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. NAM calls upon Member States to display the necessary political will and flexibility in order to enable the Commission to agree on substantive outcomes in its next cycle. For its part, NAM stands ready to engage constructively on the advancement of the issues on the disarmament agenda and on the ways and means of strengthening the disarmament machinery. NAM also reiterates that a special session of the General Assembly should be convened to address those issues.

Since the display of political will is fundamental to the disarmament machinery's effective performance, NAM urges all countries to work together, cooperate further and tangibly demonstrate their commitment to ensure that the disarmament machinery will once again, in the not-too-distant future, unleash its potential to advance peace and security for the entire world.

Mr. Aljowaily (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of Egypt, speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (see A/C.1/69/PV.2).

Since the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in 1978, the Group of Arab States has called for the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and has committed to preliminary steps towards disarmament. The Group of Arab States emphasizes that disarmament machinery should not be modified outside a special session of the Assembly convened to do so. In that context, the Group of Arab States supports the position of the Non-Aligned Movement on the holding of a new special session on disarmament.

The Group welcomes the efforts made during the 2014 session of the Conference on Disarmament and the success achieved under the Iraqi presidency in 2013, which contributed to the consensus on Conference decision 1956/Rev.1, on setting up an Informal Working Group to produce a programme of work for the Conference. The Group of Arab States underscores the need for political will in order to arrive at a programme of work that is comprehensive, balanced and takes into

account the needs of non-aligned States and developing countries.

We also reiterate that the Conference is the sole negotiating forum on matters related to disarmament. In our view, the halt in its work is due to a lack of political will among Member States. That is why we emphasize the role of the Conference on Disarmament, and why we insist that no other mechanism should be set up other than the existing machinery.

Nuclear disarmament, the fissile material cut-off treaty and negative security assurances are issues linked with the broader global disarmament agenda — one cannot be considered absent the others. These questions cannot be looked at from the non-proliferation perspective alone or without taking into account global disarmament. With regard to the fissile material cut-off issue, we have to address the question of stocks in the nuclear-weapon States.

The Group of Arab States expresses its disappointment at the fact that the Conference on Disarmament has not been able to reach consensus on any recommendation since 2000. That is due to the lack of political will and flexibility among certain nuclear-weapon States that clearly impeded any consensus at the previous session.

The Group of Arab States played a constructive role and made great efforts to achieve consensus, especially in the Working Group on non-proliferation issues. The Group would like to express its gratitude to Ambassador Naif bin Bandar Al-Sudairy, co-Chair of the Working Group, for his efforts to achieve consensus. Of course, I also thank the Working Group's Chair, the representative of Croatia.

The Group of Arab States would like to underscore the need to demonstrate political will and flexibility in achieving outcomes at the next session devoted to disarmament, as well as to ensure that the programme of work for the session takes into account the concerns of all States and places priority on nuclear disarmament, as enshrined in the resolution adopted at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2).

Ms. Hew A Kee (Suriname): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the States members of the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR). As this is the first time that my delegation takes the floor at this session, I would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chair of the First Committee.

The efforts of the international community in favour of promoting international peace and security make it essential to have a strong multilateral mechanism in the United Nations regarding disarmament and non-proliferation issues. In that connection, UNASUR renews its commitment to the mechanism established by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1978, which initiated a set of bodies with different, but complementary, functions constituting what is known as the disarmament machinery of the United Nations, with the objective of strengthening the role of the Organization in the disarmament and non-proliferation spheres.

In that regard, UNASUR wishes to highlight the machinery's achievements as reflected in several international instruments that constitute important milestones in international law, such as the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the Chemical Weapons Convention. UNASUR believes that any attempt to reform the multilateral disarmament machinery should be done in a comprehensive manner, in the context of a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

We are very concerned that for the past 16 years the States members of the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, have failed to reach an agreement on a programme of work for the substantive treatment of the items on its agenda. UNASUR urges all members of the Conference on Disarmament to show greater political will to ensure the commencement of substantive work with the adoption and implementation of a comprehensive and balanced programme of work in order to start negotiations and to advance the items on its agenda, especially those related to nuclear disarmament. In that regard, UNASUR welcomes the establishment within the Conference on Disarmament of an Informal Working Group, co-chaired by Ecuador, with the mandate of producing a robust and progressive programme of work.

In that context, UNASUR calls upon the Conference on Disarmament to overcome that prolonged impasse and to establish an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament in order to start negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. We reiterate our backing for the Secretary-General's five-point proposal on nuclear disarmament and his support for a nuclear weapons convention backed by a strong system of verification.

UNASUR believes such a convention must be negotiated within the existing multilateral system,

either at the Conference on Disarmament or, if that is not possible, at the General Assembly. UNASUR is convinced that the only guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is their total elimination. Until that goal is met, non-nuclear-weapon States must receive unequivocal, unconditional and legally binding assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons by States that possess them.

Another interim measure would be the negotiation of a multilateral and non-discriminatory treaty on fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices that includes an international verification regime and meets the objectives of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament.

We note with concern the possibility of an arms race in outer space. For that reason, we reaffirm the importance of negotiating a legally binding instrument in this field, in order to prevent the placement of weapons in that environment. We also reaffirm the importance we give to strict compliance with the current regime on the use of outer space, which recognizes the common interest of humankind in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes.

UNASUR regrets the lack of progress within the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC). We also regret the fact that substantive recommendations have not been reached in the respective working groups on nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, as well as on practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons. In that regard, while expressing appreciation for the efforts by the Chair of UNDC in 2014, His Excellency Mr. Vladimir Drobnjak, Permanent Representative of Croatia, UNASUR calls on member States to take the opportunity presented by the commencement of a new triennial cycle to exert all efforts in order to allow this United Nations deliberative body to make substantive recommendations on issues in the field of disarmament.

Finally, UNASUR would like to highlight the work being carried out by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research as an autonomous institute designed to undertake independent research on disarmament and related problems and to promote the informed participation of States in disarmament efforts. We also recognize the importance of greater interaction and participation by civil society in efforts in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation.

Mr. Simon-Michel (France) (*spoke in French*): France associates itself with the statement made yesterday afternoon by the observer of the European Union (see A/C.1/69/PV.9).

As other colleagues have done, I will be reading out a shorter version of my statement in order to respect the time limits. A full version will be made available on the Internet and will be distributed here.

France is committed to effective, multilateral disarmament that would create the conditions for a safer world by working step by step towards general and complete disarmament. Last year we expressed our concerns about a certain number of parallel initiatives in the area of nuclear disarmament. We continue to think that they are incompatible with the Action Plan on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) that was adopted by consensus in 2010. By adopting a stigmatization approach, such initiatives can only lead to division rather than inclusion. They also run the risk of fundamentally calling into question and undermining the NPT, which is something we consider to be of extreme concern, especially as we work up to the 2015 Review Conference.

Significant progress has been made at the Conference on Disarmament (CD). The schedule of activities enabled substantive discussions to be held as never before on each of the four core issues, and those discussions confirmed in particular that the subject of the fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) was ripe for taking up. Better understanding the positions of one another, minimizing divergences and identifying possible avenues for compromise are all essential for us to move forward. Of course, that is not enough. More than ever our aim remains to move on to the next stage and to begin negotiations in accordance with the priority set for us by Action 15 of the NPT Action Plan, and in line with decision CD/1864. It is true, however, that the debates held this year at the Conference on Disarmament are helping the move in that direction. It is important to recognize that progress.

Progress has also been made on the FMCT thanks to the very substantial discussions during the first two sessions of the Group of Governmental Experts, which took place in 2014. The work of the Group of Governmental Experts will continue in 2015, and we look forward to a report that includes the essential elements necessary to facilitate the negotiation of an FMCT at the Conference on Disarmament in

accordance with document CD/1299 and the mandate set out therein.

The United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) is an integral part of the disarmament machinery. Although it is an independent institution, its work is directly linked to ongoing negotiations and debates. It has an irreplaceable added value. I should like to express my warm thanks and appreciation to the Director, Ms. Theresa Hitchens, for her work over the past six years.

The United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs plays an important role in support of the disarmament machinery. Due to its impartiality, it will be in a position usefully to facilitate a better common understanding among delegations and progress in our negotiations.

In spite of an unfavourable international context, disarmament and arms control have made progress in 2014. The Arms Trade Treaty will enter into force by the end of this year. A reflection on the issue of lethal autonomous weapons systems took place in May under the auspices of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which moreover is continuing to see new accessions. The Maputo Review Conference on Anti-Personnel Mines concluded successfully. The implementation of the NPT 2010 Action Plan is also making progress, with the five nuclear-weapon States submitting their report under Actions 5, 20 and 21 of the Action Plan, and the signing in May of the Protocol to the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia. The work of the five permanent members of the Security Council is also continuing.

As we have already recalled, the step-by-step approach is the only one capable of becoming a foundation for long-term progress while continuing to build confidence among us.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): As this is the first time that I take the floor at this session of the First Committee — yesterday I arrived from Moscow and met with the leadership of our delegation on the second part of the work of the First Committee — please allow me to reiterate our congratulations, Sir, and assure you of our cooperation. I am sure that this session will be successful, as many delegations have told me how well you work and how skilful you are. I assure you that we will assist you as much as we can.

During the general debate many delegations talked about the negative situation that has resulted due to the insufficient effectiveness of the activities of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Geneva Conference on Disarmament (CD). In our view it would be logical at the beginning to look at the reasons for the long impasse in their work. If we look objectively at the situation, it becomes clear that the source of the impasse in the Commission and in the Conference is hardly the bureaucracy, the rules of procedure or a lack of clarity in the agenda items. The source of the impasse in the work of the Conference and the Commission is the lack of effectiveness in our joint work in those disarmament mechanisms. I am talking about all States together and individually. Any agreement between States in such a sensitive area as arms control, or moreover disarmament, is a system of extremely complex mutual compromises, as what we are talking about is national security. Therefore, please, let us talk openly.

In the current conditions, the growing strategic lack of stability in global affairs means that States parties do not have the political will to move forward and seek compromises in the area of disarmament. It is clear that alternatives to the existing United Nations disarmament forums are not available in the foreseeable future. We cannot forget that upon the creation of the disarmament machinery under the United Nations and their very foundation we, together, enshrined very important principles of interconnectedness, intercomplementarity, and an orientation on a single goal for all three of its elements — the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the Conference on Disarmament and the First Committee. Joined by one goal, the three mechanisms are called upon, in accordance with their mandates, to carry out specific functions, the implementation of which is not able to be delegated to any other forum created on those principles and rules of procedure.

Nevertheless, we can see that there are examples of the creation and work of forums for the solution of specific issues on the disarmament agenda. However, in those cases discussions are only about very narrow specialized areas and are aimed at the achievement of very limited specifics of their mandate for results. Let us remember that none of those forums can have as broad a scope, as broad an agenda and expertise as the existing United Nations disarmament triad.

Taking into account those obvious and well-known understandings, the Russian Federation will continue

to consistently actively search for mutually acceptable solutions in the area of disarmament. We call on all States to follow our example, as other alternatives in the area of disarmament simply do not exist. Our main task here is revitalizing the United Nations disarmament triad by jointly searching for real decisions — and I emphasize decisions acceptable to all — for the current issues facing us.

The potential for ideas that have already been expressed has not been exhausted, and we must still search for new ideas. Hopeful signs emerged from the last session of the Conference on Disarmament, the participants in which carried out additional work both on the agreement of a programme of work in the framework of an specially established Informal Working Group, and also on all issues on the agenda. That was all done in the format of extensive thematic discussions. Further questions on the programme of work still have not been decided. Efforts of delegations were aimed at brainstorming, which laid down the main foundation for further constructive work. The thematic discussions, which were topical and based on expertise, resulted in a positive assessment on the part of their participants.

We expect that the delegations of the First Committee will support those positive moves forward, which could lead to a deblocking of the negotiated activities. All States should and must make a strong contribution to the process of revitalizing the Conference by adopting, without a vote, the traditional draft resolution on the report of the Conference. Also of extreme importance is the fact that the group of those who have the same line of thinking for the third session in a row are coming out with joint statements in support of the Conference.

Please allow me now to read out a document on behalf of Argentina, Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Syria and Tajikistan, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe. We drafted the statement in English, so I will read it out in English.

(spoke in English)

Recalling the joint statements delivered by like-minded States in the First Committee at the sixty-seventh and sixty-eighth sessions, we reaffirm our commitment to the resumption of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament without further delay.

We are confident that tangible progress in multilateral disarmament and in strengthening international regimes of arms control and non-proliferation can be achieved only within the framework of the existing multilateral disarmament mechanisms, in particular the Conference on Disarmament, taking into due account national security priorities of member States.

We believe that the Conference, as the single multilateral negotiating forum, with its fundamental principle of consensus and its membership, cannot be substituted by any other forum for the purpose of addressing the complex issues on its agenda. We commend the efforts by all the 2014 CD Presidents to reach consensus on a programme of work. At the same time, we are concerned about the lack of progress in this regard.

We welcome the re-establishment of the Informal Working Group with a mandate to produce a programme of work robust in substance and progressive over time in implementation, and we commend the Informal Working Group co-Chair, the Ambassador of Ecuador, Mr. Luis Gallegos Chiriboga, as well as co-Chair Ambassador Peter Woolcott of Australia, for their efforts to find an acceptable solution.

We call on the States participating in the work of the Conference to demonstrate political will in order to reach agreement on a balanced and comprehensive programme of work and resume its substantive work on the core issues of the CD agenda — nuclear disarmament, a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, the prevention of an arms race in outer space, effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons — in accordance with its mandate and its rules of procedure.

Pending the adoption of such a programme of work, structured and results-oriented discussions are to be encouraged in the Conference. In that regard, we welcome the structured and substantive discussions held by the Conference throughout its 2014 session. We call upon all States concerned to live up to their responsibilities and to exert every effort in order to overcome the long-lasting impasse at the CD.

(spoke in Russian)

The Russian delegation requests that this statement be published as an official document of the First Committee. We will leave open the list of sponsors right

through to the end of the current session. We call on all States that care about the future of the Conference on Disarmament to join this statement in support of the Conference. I have just received information that Armenia has joined as a sponsor. We hope that, in the very near future — based, among other things, on the positive results of discussions at this session of the First Committee — together we will be able to come up with decisions that will facilitate the strengthening of the multilateral disarmament machinery so as to increase the effectiveness of the activities of its structures and prompt the beginning of targeted work within their frameworks in accordance with their mandates.

The Chair: Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I remind delegations kindly to limit their interventions to five minutes when speaking in a national capacity and seven minutes when speaking on behalf of several delegations.

I now give the floor to the representative of Malaysia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.8.

Mr. Muhammad (Malaysia): My delegation has asked for the floor to introduce to the First Committee the draft resolution entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament” (A/C.1/69/L.8). As I elaborated on the work of the Conference during 2014 at the panel discussion on the disarmament machinery yesterday, I will just briefly introduce the draft resolution.

I should like to take this opportunity to extend Malaysia’s appreciation to all delegations for the constructive spirit and flexibility shown during the negotiations on the report as well as on the draft resolution. It is my sincere hope that the draft resolution will be adopted without a vote, as was the case with similar resolutions in the past.

The draft resolution is the outcome of extensive consultations conducted in Geneva. Despite a few challenging moments, the agreement of all delegations on the draft resolution is proof of the strength of multilateralism in bridging the different views and positions. In my view, the draft resolution is a fair and balanced reflection of the report of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in 2014. The main focus of the draft resolution remains the same as it has been at previous sessions, with the necessary technical updates as well as additions that reflect the work of the CD this year.

One minor, yet important, change this year is the reference to the CD as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. This change was to

reflect accurately the term used in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S/10-2) which, as members are all aware, established the Conference on Disarmament.

The draft resolution notes with concern that the CD was unable to commence substantive work this year, including negotiations, despite the efforts of successive Presidents and of Member States. It does, however, welcome the decision of the Conference to re-establish the Informal Working Group to produce a programme of work, as well as the informal discussions on all items on the agenda under the schedule of activities. As I highlighted yesterday, both mechanisms were seen as contributing positively to the work of the Conference.

The draft resolution also takes note of the discussions on the functioning of the Conference in 2014, which was addressed by many delegations and by the Deputy Secretary-General himself. It continues to emphasize the importance of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research as a stand-alone, autonomous institution, and recognizes the importance of engagement between civil society and the CD.

With the CD being in deadlock for nearly two decades, the draft resolution calls upon the Conference to further intensify consultations with a view to the adoption and implementation of a balanced and comprehensive programme of work at the earliest possible date during the 2015 session. As the current President of the Conference, this will certainly be the focus of my consultations with the incoming President from Mexico during the intersessional period.

In conclusion, let me reiterate my hope that the Committee will be able to adopt without a vote the draft resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. AlAjmi (Kuwait) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation associates itself with the statement delivered earlier at this meeting by the representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt on behalf of the Group of Arab States, as well as with the statement delivered by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (see A/C.1/69/PV.2).

Kuwait reiterates its previous positions with regard to the importance of multilateral work. It is the best way to rise to the challenges and to address issues related to disarmament and non-proliferation, while also promoting cooperation and coordination

at the regional and international levels in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations with a view to maintaining international peace and security. Promoting the effectiveness of the multilateral disarmament machinery — the Conference on Disarmament (CD), the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the First Committee — should therefore aim at guaranteeing the implementation of the roles entrusted to them during the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in 1978.

The State of Kuwait expresses its concern over the chronic deadlock in the CD. The absence of political will on the part of some members of the Conference on Disarmament was a real challenge and obstacle that obstructed the work to agree on an agenda. Despite those challenges, the State of Kuwait welcomes Conference decision 1956/Rev.1, which established the Informal Working Group with a clear mandate to come up with an agenda that can be implemented gradually according to a time frame. We hope that efforts will lead to a consensus that will allow the CD to start addressing core issues on its agenda.

The State of Kuwait also welcomes the proposal to appoint a special rapporteur on an increase in the membership of the Conference on Disarmament, as participation by the greatest number of countries in that primary forum would enhance international efforts to make tangible progress on many issues that are still on its agenda.

We also stress the importance of the United Nations Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body where some of the most important issues and new initiatives on disarmament are discussed and where new proposals are made on issues of vital importance in the field of disarmament. That forum still lacks the ability to achieve consensus on issues related to disarmament that have been part of its substantive sessions since 2000. My delegation hopes that international efforts will continue to strengthen the United Nations disarmament machinery so that we can achieve the total elimination of all weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, and address all the concerns resulting from the proliferation of all forms of technology and weapons.

Mr. Al-Taie (Iraq) (*spoke in French*): As this is the first time that I take the floor at this session, please allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chair of the First Committee for 2014. I am certain that your wisdom and experience will help us to achieve

good results. I should like to take this opportunity to wish you and the other members of the Bureau success in your work.

(spoke in Arabic)

At the outset, my delegation would like to express its support for the statements delivered earlier by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (see A/C.1/69/PV.2) and by the representative of Egypt, on behalf of the member States of the League of Arab States.

The Government of Iraq attaches great importance to the issue of general and complete disarmament. We recognize that the arms race will not lead to permanent peace and security. On the contrary, it is a major cause of tension and instability. The Government of Iraq is committed to disarmament agreements and conventions and to instruments on non-proliferation. That stems from our firm belief that universal adherence to international conventions on weapons of mass destruction, international compliance with such conventions without discrimination and the total elimination of these weapons are among the main pillars that provide a real guarantee to the international community when it comes to limiting the use of weapons of mass destruction and threats of the use of such weapons.

Furthermore, that would guarantee the achievement of international peace and security by arriving at common and practical solutions through negotiations in a multilateral context so that collective agreements can be concluded. As such, Iraq has joined all major conventions on disarmament and has confirmed its full commitment to the implementation of all their provisions and requirements.

The delegation of Iraq stresses the importance of the role of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) as the multilateral deliberative body entrusted with questions of disarmament in the United Nations. The importance of the UNDC in this complicated international environment becomes more salient in view of current regional crises and terrorist threats, as well as the exacerbation of the risks posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the inertia currently witnessed in the disarmament field. All that threatens international stability.

My delegation expresses its concern at the fact that the Disarmament Commission has not been able to adopt recommendations on the items, "Recommendations

for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" and "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons". In the same context, my delegation would like to thank the Commission's Chair at its 2014 session, Ambassador Vladimir Drobnjak, for his efforts. Iraq supports the contents of the paper submitted at the informal meeting held last month, which would break the inertia with which the work of the Disarmament Commission has been afflicted since 2000 and would likely augur well for the resumption of the Commission's important work so that it can make progress on disarmament.

Iraq attaches special importance to the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, which has a record of successes in the field. However, regrettably, the Conference on Disarmament has been undergoing an extremely critical period. For more than 18 years, the Conference has not been able to exercise its negotiating role on disarmament instruments due to the failure to agree on a programme of work. Therefore, we must redouble our efforts so that we can arrive at a balanced and comprehensive programme of work that responds to the concerns of Member States and is commensurate with the statute of the Conference to enable us to make progress.

Iraq shares with other Member States their positions on the need to keep nuclear disarmament among the priorities of the Conference according to the special status accorded to that topic at the 1978 first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, as well as the 1996 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (A/51/218, annex), which confirms that the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons runs counter to the provisions of international law with regard to armed conflicts. Therefore, countries must seek in good faith to undertake negotiations that lead to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under international supervision. We stress that nuclear disarmament should be among our first priorities. The destructive nature of those weapons makes their complete and permanent elimination a necessity for the survival of humankind. The existence of such weapons poses a threat to international peace and security.

Mr. Marn (Slovenia): As this is the first time that my delegation takes the floor at this session I also would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, and other members of the Bureau on your elections,

and to pledge our support to you in your efforts to successfully guide our work.

I should also like to align Slovenia with the statement delivered on behalf of the European Union (see A/C.1/69/PV.9), as well as to add a few points that are important for Slovenia.

As a staunch supporter of effective multilateralism, Slovenia believes that international organizations serve their purpose in assisting Member States to make the world a better place. Unfortunately, that is not always the case with the multilateral disarmament machinery. The disarmament machinery, in particular the Conference on Disarmament (CD) and the United Nations Disarmament Commission, is failing to respond to the challenges of the present time and is constantly underperforming.

Slovenia is particularly frustrated with the continuous impasse at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. We regret that once again the Conference did not succeed in commencing negotiations on international disarmament agreements, thus failing to fulfil its mandate. We continue to believe that the Conference should start negotiations on the fissile material cut-off treaty as soon as possible. We call upon CD Member States to take the necessary decisions.

We welcome this year's appointment at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva of the Ambassador of Albania as a friend of the CD President on the issue of enlargement. We regret that this fact was not noted in the annual report of the Conference or in the relevant draft resolution. Slovenia continues to believe that the enlargement of the Conference on Disarmament is urgent. We are convinced that the declaration of the tenth special session of the General Assembly (resolution S-10/2, II), which states that all States have the right to participate in disarmament negotiations, remains valid. That is why we continue to call upon the Conference to decide on enlargement as soon as possible. In our view, new members would not present stumbling blocks, but rather would enrich the work of the Conference and contribute new ideas for its proceedings.

In conclusion, we should continue to seek ways to improve the existing disarmament machinery. Slovenia closely followed the work of the Open-ended Working Group that was established in 2012 to take forward multilateral negotiations, which convened in Geneva in

the spring of 2013. In our opinion, that was a useful exercise that could perhaps be repeated.

Mr. van der Kwast (Netherlands): In order to be able to deal in a resolute and coherent way with global security challenges and the growing public and political interest in disarmament that the international community faces today, well-functioning disarmament machinery is absolutely required. The current paralysis of some parts of the disarmament machinery is of great concern to the Netherlands, and we continue to press for its revitalization and for new initiatives.

The Conference on Disarmament (CD) saw some encouraging developments during its the 2014 session, with good and thorough discussions under the schedule of activities. All core issues were discussed, and the Informal Working Group studied further possibilities for a programme of work. We also considered the suggestions of the Acting Secretary-General of the CD regarding the possibility of negotiating a framework agreement as a positive contribution.

Unfortunately, yet again, it proved not possible to agree on the start of negotiations. Regrettably, therefore, the stalemate continues. However, we think that the continuation of the work of the Informal Working Group can be useful. We hope that the CD can further build on that positive momentum at its 2015 session. The Netherlands is currently exploring options to that effect together with the other five Presidents of the 2015 session.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) has concluded another triennial cycle without agreeing on substantive recommendations. Against that background, we support the consideration given to the working methods of the UNDC. We underline the need for the UNDC to have a more focused and results-oriented discussion on the agenda items. We fully support the efforts of the Croatian Chair in that regard.

With regard to both the CD and the UNDC, we are of the opinion that these forums would benefit from the contributions of civil society. We think it is useful to have special meetings of both forums with the participation of non-governmental organizations, scientists and other experts in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation.

With regard to the First Committee, we are grateful for the progress made so far and for the professional guidance by you, Mr. Chair. Concerning

the effective functioning of the Committee, we have two remarks — related mainly to the way we deal with draft resolutions.

First, at this session we have received quite a number of draft resolutions rather late, just before the deadline or even on the day of the deadline. Due to that, time and a possibility to discuss the texts before the first printing was issued were very limited. Of course, there is always a possibility to issue revised versions, but we all know that that usually limits the possibilities for consultations. For that reason, my delegation pleads for an earlier presentation of the draft texts in order to make timely consultations possible. That would enhance transparency and the quality of our work here.

Secondly, we appreciated the introduction by the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs on 15 October on the follow-up to resolutions through reporting. Although that is not new, we think that the fact that 95 per cent of all Member States, often including sponsors, do not provide their views in the requested reports is not acceptable. We therefore think we should take that into account in our future work, as well as in resolutions and in their drafting. Therefore, we would ask the Bureau to consult with the different groups on this issue and to make proposals to avoid unnecessary requests in future.

The revitalization of the disarmament machinery is also an important topic on the agenda of the General Assembly. At its sixty-sixth session, the Netherlands, together with Switzerland and South Africa, introduced a draft resolution on revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations. Its 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. The Committee adopted the draft resolution by consensus, and subsequently the General Assembly did as well (resolution 66/66). This year, as during the two previous sessions of the First Committee, the authors of that resolution elected to introduce a draft decision to include this item on the agenda of the First Committee at its seventieth session.

Notwithstanding some encouraging developments, it is rather clear that much more remains to be done to revitalize the work of the CD and the United Nations disarmament machinery. We will continue to advocate progress to that end, and we stand ready to engage

with all delegations on revisiting the implementation of resolution 66/66 next year.

Mr. Wu Jianjian (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The current multilateral disarmament machinery, including the First Committee, the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC), the Conference on Disarmament (CD) and the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters, were established pursuant to the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2). As the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, the CD and its predecessors successfully concluded treaties such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. As a deliberative body with the function of considering and making recommendations on various issues in the field of disarmament, over the years the UNDC has formulated consensus principles, guidelines and recommendations, including guidelines for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The current disarmament machinery and its achievements have made a tremendous contribution to international peace and stability, promoting a just order in the field of arms control and disarmament.

The international community is concerned about the lack of substantial progress in the CD and the UNDC in recent years. The root cause of the current stalemate in the multilateral disarmament machinery lies first in political factors, rather than the machinery itself or its rules of procedure. On the other hand, the profound and complex changes in the international security landscape constitute important factors preventing the CD and the UNDC from making progress. Under new circumstances we should, in a spirit of facing the reality and shaping future developments, uphold the principles of undiminished security for all and the maintenance of strategic balance and stability, and strive for feasible solutions to revitalize the work of the current multilateral disarmament machinery.

First, political will should be strengthened and efforts should be made to find a breakthrough out of the current stalemate. All parties should demonstrate adequate political will, the necessary flexibility and mutual respect, bridge differences and seek common ground through consultations on an equal footing. Efforts should be made to reach solutions that can be accepted by all so as to promote the start of substantive work in the CD and the UNDC at an early date.

Secondly, the principle of consensus should be preserved. Disarmament matters relate to international security and the fundamental security interests of all countries. The principle of consensus, which forms the core of the rules of procedure of the CD and the UNDC, constitutes an important institutional guarantee to safeguard the national security interests of different countries. Abandoning the existing disarmament machinery and creating new forums will not guarantee the participation of all countries or the universality of their possible outcomes.

Thirdly, a favourable security environment should be nurtured. We should fully acknowledge the implications of the international and regional security situation in the disarmament and arms control process. And we should, through enhanced dialogue and communications, increase the level of mutual trust and accommodate the legitimate security concerns of the relevant countries so as to create positive conditions and a favourable atmosphere for revitalizing the work of the CD and the UNDC.

China supports the joint statement in support of the CD made by the Russian Federation on behalf of a group of countries. China welcomes this year's new developments in the work of the CD, including the re-establishment of the Informal Working Group on producing a programme of work, and the in-depth discussions on all agenda items according to the schedule of activities. We hope that all the parties will value and embrace the current positive developments in the CD and actively promote the early start of substantive work based on a comprehensive and balanced programme of work.

China commends and supports the constructive efforts by Ambassador Drobnjak, the previous Chair of the UNDC, in trying to revitalize the work of the Commission. China has submitted its views and recommendations on revitalizing the work of the UNDC, including a recommendation for the Commission to deliberate on such new issues as guiding principles for the maintenance of information and cybersecurity and for the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Together with other parties, China will continue to make contributions to promoting the revitalization of the current multilateral disarmament machinery under the framework of the United Nations.

Mr. Tanalinov (Kazakhstan): I thank you, Mr. Chair, for this discussion on the most critical subject of the

disarmament machinery, which needs to be revitalized if it is to remain effective and relevant to the challenges and threats of the twenty-first century. I will briefly touch upon each of the entities — the Conference on Disarmament (CD), the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) and the First Committee — as well as on regional disarmament branches and the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR).

The increasing frustration of the international community over the Conference on Disarmament is expressed loudly and clearly. Analysis shows that nuclear weapons are tied up with the security perceptions of many States, whether they possess such weapons or not. Any disarmament forum must therefore be multilateral and take decisions by consensus. The CD is at the heart of that process. Kazakhstan urges members to engage constructively and to make a concerted effort towards progress. A fully functional Conference is fundamental, and the disarmament community represents a unique cluster of expertise on a vast range of issues. The CD must move beyond the initial step of establishing an Informal Working Group to consider taking action on other proposals made by Mr. Kassym-Zhomart Tokayev, former Secretary-General of the Conference.

The proposal to establish a subsidiary organ to improve the CD's effective functioning is critical to making consensus-building easier. The way the Conference approaches its programme of work requires thorough scrutiny. Dissociating the adoption of the programme of work from the specific mandate on issues on the agenda could contribute to putting an end to the current situation. Enlarging the membership and increasing civil society participation, and all other proposals by Member States, are worthy opinions.

The second entity, the Disarmament Commission, with its focus on just two agenda items, notwithstanding new unprecedented political developments, is cause for concern. The UNDC needs to follow up on draft resolutions adopted in the First Committee and address more critically the alarming threats to peace and security witnessed today. Kazakhstan would like to express its sincere appreciation to Ambassador Drobnjak, Chair of the 2014 session of the UNDC, for his very insightful and painstaking set of recommendations to reinvigorate the Commission, which need to be implemented with political will and commitment.

In the past 10 years, several measures have been taken to rationalize the working methods of the First Committee. With the aim of achieving efficiency and

effectiveness, the Committee streamlined its work, resolutions were biennialized or triennialized, and reports were consolidated among other efficiency-driven measures. Yet the effectiveness, authority and results are questioned. More important, improvements have not led to progress on substance or forward movement. Much time is still spent on voting on a large number of outdated draft resolutions — when geopolitical circumstances have changed dramatically.

We also note with satisfaction the Open-ended Working Group on multilateral disarmament negotiations, which has adhered to the principles of openness, transparency and inclusivity. While Kazakhstan has supported the resolution entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”, it strongly believes that all recommendations of the Open-ended Working Group must be considered in the CD.

My delegation would like to recognize with appreciation the work of UNIDIR, with its special responsibility as an independent body with a mandate tailored to meet the needs of Member States, which we call upon to support with their political will and funding. We also acknowledge the contribution of regional branches for peace and security in Asia, Africa and the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States region. We call on Member States to support their activities with greater political will and funding.

The Arms Trade Treaty is an indication of what multilateralism can achieve, as is the recent success of the Group of Governmental Experts on a fissile material cut-off treaty. Those are success stories that prove that we can still accomplish much through diplomacy and global cooperation. That gives great hope and confidence for the future. Kazakhstan is optimistically committed to engaging fully with the international community in strengthening the disarmament machinery in order to contribute to peace and security.

Mr. Sunelaitis (Lithuania): Lithuania aligns itself with the statement made by the observer of the European Union on behalf of its States members (see A/C.1/69/PV.9). Let me now elaborate on some matters of particular importance to Lithuania.

Lithuania reaffirms its strong attachment to the multilateral approach to non-proliferation and disarmament. We regard the First Committee, the Conference on Disarmament (CD), the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the United Nations

Institute for Disarmament Research and the relevant international treaties and regimes as essential, mutually reinforcing elements of the United Nations disarmament machinery.

Some progress has been made in the CD this year. However, we are disappointed that the CD did not succeed in commencing its substantive work, including negotiations. The long-standing impasse at the Conference has already seriously undermined its credibility, as negotiations on the multilateral disarmament and arms control treaties — such as the Anti-Personnel Mines Convention, the Convention on Cluster Munitions and the Arms Trade Treaty — now take place outside it.

The need for the CD's enlargement has been a pending issue for more than a decade, and it needs to be addressed without delay. This call is in line with the rules of procedure of the CD, which provide for a review of the membership question at regular intervals. In that regard, we welcome the decision to appoint the Friend of the CD President on the enlargement of the membership. We hope that will further stimulate the discussions leading to the expansion of the CD membership.

Mrs. Del Sol Dominguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me to reiterate the importance that Cuba attaches to the need to make specific progress in negotiations and deliberations in the field of disarmament and arms weapons. We attach particular priority to nuclear disarmament. Similarly, Cuba reiterates the importance of promoting multilateralism as the basic principle for negotiations on disarmament, as well as of finding agreed solutions on a multilateral basis and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. That is the only sustainable way of tackling issues related to disarmament and international security. In that context, we recall that the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament established the United Nations disarmament machinery that we have today, where each component part plays a fundamental role and has specific functions that must be preserved.

The Conference on Disarmament plays an essential role as the sole multilateral disarmament treaty negotiating forum. We lament the fact that the Conference has not been able to undertake substantive work for more than a decade. Some Member States believe that the paralysis is due to the working methods and rules of procedure of the Conference. Cuba does not

share that appraisal. Historically, the Conference has been capable of producing treaties when the political will of all its members has prevailed. Furthermore, the lack of progress in the area of disarmament is not exclusive to the Conference.

The Conference on Disarmament should adopt, as soon as possible, a broad-ranging and balanced programme of work that takes into account the real priorities in the area of disarmament. Cuba believes that the Conference is prepared in parallel to negotiate a treaty that prohibits and eliminates nuclear weapons, a treaty to prevent an arms race in outer space, a treaty that provides effective security assurances for States that, like Cuba, do not possess nuclear weapons, and a treaty that prohibits the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices that also addresses existing weapons. The negotiation of a fissile material treaty would be a positive but insufficient step if it failed to define the next steps to achieve nuclear disarmament. We believe that the proposal of the Non-Aligned Movement as soon as possible to begin negotiations to conclude an encompassing convention on nuclear weapons — to prohibit their possession, development, production, acquisition, testing, storage, transfer, use or threat of their use, as well as to stipulate their destruction — would be the most effective and efficient decision to take.

The States Members of the United Nations have a responsibility to react urgently to the growing call from the international community to totally eliminate and prohibit nuclear weapons. The recent commemoration of the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons on 26 September has, for the first time in history, contributed to exchanging proposals and promoting the coordination of national, regional and international efforts aimed at nuclear disarmament.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission has the important role of complementing negotiations and going further into depth in studying disarmament subjects through debate. That can be done with the participation of all States Members of the United Nations under the principles and standards set out for the Organization. Its effectiveness is demonstrated by historical records of its work where recommendations have proved to feed into international treaties on disarmament and the adoption of national, regional and international disarmament and weapons control treaties. The failure of the Disarmament Commission

to make recommendations on items under discussion should not be attributed to its functioning. For history has shown that, when Member States want a positive result, one has been achieved. Notwithstanding the fact that no concrete recommendations have emerged from its work, Cuba believes that the deliberations of the Commission are positive.

Cuba reiterates its concern about the growing trend of setting up expert groups with limited composition to analyse issues on the disarmament and arms control agenda that are extremely sensitive and of interest to all Member States. Setting up such groups should be the exception and not the rule. Their work should adhere strictly to transparency and make it possible for Member States to participate on an equal footing.

Allow me to conclude by reiterating that Cuba supports efforts undertaken to optimize the United Nations disarmament machinery. However, we are fully convinced that the lack of specific results coming out of these bodies is due to a lack of political will on the part of some Member States, in particular when it comes to nuclear disarmament. While there is a need to revitalize the United Nations disarmament machinery, we must also not stand in the way of holding the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Cuba will continue to make every effort to respond to the expectations of the international community in the area of disarmament.

Mr. Kellerman (South Africa): South Africa welcomes the advances made during the past year in strengthening the international rule of law in the multilateral disarmament and international security environment. However, we believe much remains to be done. Progress on the various undertakings towards disarmament has yet to be realized. Of particular concern to South Africa is the continuing impasse in the United Nations disarmament machinery, established through the 1978 first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We believe that the prolonged stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament (CD) and the lack of agreement in the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) are weakening the multilateral system. Those bodies need to be revitalized so that they can again discharge their respective mandates.

Of particular concern to my delegation is the 18-year stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament. As a country committed to the resumption of substantive work in the CD, we believe we have exercised the

greatest level of flexibility and repeatedly supported proposals that stop far short of what we would deem optimum solutions. We did so on the understanding that such deliberations may pave the way for eventual negotiations.

We welcome the establishment of the Informal Working Group to develop a programme of work in accordance with decisions CD/1974 and CD/1978, on a schedule of activities that allowed the CD to undertake informal discussions on the items on its agenda. While some may have supported those efforts with the aim of creating the illusion of movement in the CD, our support was informed by our desire to explore all avenues aimed at the resumption of negotiations — and we will continue to do so during the coming year.

The UNDC concluded the third year in its three-year cycle in April with the adoption of merely a procedural report. While working papers by delegations and non-papers by the Chairs were circulated, and elements thereof discussed, in the two working groups, no consensus could be reached on the non-papers of the respective working group Chairs. Discussions were mostly long on procedure and short on substance, and not particularly focused on the various papers. In spite of initial expectations that the session would be able to build on initial work done during the past three years, we managed to make progress. But that was not enough to reach a set of substantive recommendations to the General Assembly.

With each passing year it has become clearer that the vast majority of States Members of the United Nations are exasperated with the lack of progress on nuclear disarmament. Last year Member States actively participated in the Open-ended Working Group to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations, and the General Assembly convened the successful High-level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament (see A/68/PV.11). The outcomes of the High-level Meeting and the Open-ended Working Group demonstrate what is indeed possible. They also provide the opportunity to move away from the disagreements that sometimes define other forums, towards the fuller consideration of the elements that will be required to achieve and maintain our shared commitment to a nuclear-weapon-free world. Rather than serving as a so-called distraction, those initiatives have injected new energy into the work of the multilateral forums.

In 2011 South Africa, together with the Netherlands and Switzerland, put forward a draft resolution aimed

at the revitalization of the multilateral disarmament machinery. The Assembly adopted it by consensus as resolution 66/66, and resolved to explore, consider and consolidate options, proposals and elements for revitalizing the United Nations disarmament machinery, including the CD. With further activities planned for 2015, South Africa believes that solutions can be found and that multilateral governance and the international rule of law in the area of disarmament could be strengthened. South Africa will remain actively and constructively engaged in the CD and other multilateral disarmament forums with a view to seeking solutions.

In conclusion, my delegation also wishes to recognize the important role and contribution of civil society in the field of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. It is our hope that interaction among Governments, members of civil society and academia could be further enhanced so that we can all benefit from the variety of insights and ideas presented by those different constituencies.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Peru to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.55.

Ms. Peña Doig (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): On behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, it is an honour for my delegation to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.55, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean”. The draft resolution is based on resolution 67/66 and on the Secretary-General’s report on the activities carried out by the Centre between July 2013 and June 2014 (A/69/136).

On this occasion, we think it is important to share with the Committee some of the key achievements and activities of the Regional Centre in the field of peace, disarmament and development, with a view not only to showing members of the Committee what efforts have been made in the region and by the Organization but also to making an appeal for the need for greater international cooperation to work together for peace, disarmament and development in Latin America and the Caribbean.

The Centre carried out a project in Central America to destroy small arms and light weapons and munitions. It managed to destroy 50,655 weapons and 64 tons of munitions, as well as 124 storage facilities. In South America, the Centre supported the destruction of

weapons and storage facilities and managed to destroy nearly 10,000 firearms and securing 40 installations. Throughout the region, the Centre has managed to train more than 900 security officers.

When it comes to weapons of mass destruction, the Centre has implemented an assistance package for strengthening the implementation of Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) for the countries of the Caribbean, with a view to supporting legislative reform and training in the security field in those countries. Furthermore, we should note the important role played by the Regional Centre when it comes to promoting the participation of women and boosting their contribution to disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control.

All of those initiatives are being carried out with scarce economic resources. As such, it is important to note the crucial assistance received for the Regional Centre's activities from some States in the region, as well as Governments such as those of the United States, Canada, Germany, Finland, Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and Sweden, and from organizations such as the Organization of American States, whose financial contributions have been essential to carrying out important work and activities. We urge Member States of the region and other Member States to step up their efforts through voluntary contributions allowing us to broaden the scope of activities carried out by the Centre. States with important investments in the region should see such voluntary contributions not just as commendable efforts to achieve peace and disarmament, but also as a way of helping to consolidate security and institutional stability in the region, which will be to the benefit of all the countries of the region, as well as those that invest in the region.

Identifying areas where the Centre should focus its work is a key topic and that has been carried out excellently by the different administrations running the Centre, particularly by the current Director, Ms. Melanie Régimbal, and her team. They are in charge of planning and implementing the activities of the Regional Centre in New York and in Lima. We acknowledge their work in particular.

For the reasons I have mentioned, my delegation thanks all countries in the region for their contributions and commitments in making it possible to introduce this draft resolution on behalf of our regional group. We would also like to reiterate the support of the Centre for the work carried out by the United Nations at the regional level to strengthen peace, stability, security

and development. For that reason we believe, as with similar draft resolutions in previous years, that we can count on the support of all delegations to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

Finally, I would like to inform members that, that on 21 October in Room A at 3.15 p.m., a meeting of donors and States will take place to present the programme of activities of the Regional Centres, including the one in our region.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Nepal to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.9.

Mr. Lamsal (Nepal): I thank you, Sir, for giving me the floor to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.9 under sub-item (e) of agenda item 97, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific". The sponsors of the draft resolution are Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Viet Nam and my country, Nepal. My delegation expresses its sincere gratitude to all the sponsors and to the other delegations that will join as sponsors.

The United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific was established by resolution 42/39 D, of November 1987, and resolution 44/117 F, of 15 December 1989, with its headquarters in Kathmandu. As per the resolutions, the Regional Centre is mandated to provide, on request, substantive support for the initiatives and other activities mutually agreed upon by the Member States of the Asia-Pacific region for the implementation of measures for peace and disarmament affairs.

Nepal believes that the regional disarmament mechanism complements efforts to promote the global disarmament agenda. Since its relocation in Kathmandu in 2008, the Regional Centre has been actively engaged in and supporting peace and disarmament initiatives in Asia and the Pacific region. The Regional Centre serves as a common forum to assess the progress achieved in the areas of disarmament and non-proliferation, and to discuss the way forward through the sharing of experiences and best practices, as well as education and awareness-building. While continued regional dialogue among the Member States of the region on those various aspects goes a long way towards creating and sustaining an environment conducive to disarmament

and non-proliferation, the Centre's activities need expansion and consolidation in view of the challenges facing the region.

As the host country to the Regional Centre, Nepal pledges its commitment to providing all possible support to the Centre to make it an effective primary United Nations regional entity dealing with disarmament and non-proliferation issues in the Asia and Pacific region.

I should like to take this opportunity to express Nepal's sincere appreciation to those Member States that have extended their continued support to the Regional Centre, including through the voluntary contributions for the programmes and activities of the Centre. We are confident that more Member States will lend their support to expand and enrich the Centre's activities in the course of promoting peace and stability in the region and beyond. It is in that context that my delegation has the honour to introduce to the Committee, on behalf of the sponsors, the draft resolution entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", with technical updates on the Centre's work over the past year. My delegation is confident that the Committee will adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

Ms. González Román (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): First and foremost, I should like to say that Spain aligns itself with the statement made by the observer of the European Union (see A/C.1/69/PV.2), but would like to make a few comments in its national capacity.

In promoting peace, efforts in the area of non-proliferation are as important as those undertaken to achieve disarmament. Spain works with other members of the international community to promote balanced policies to achieve both goals. We need collective political will to make progress in this area in everyone's interest. Disarmament, non-proliferation and collective efforts towards world stability are different dimensions of the same process: the search for peace and security throughout the world.

With that in mind, we must reiterate once again our concern at the stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament — the only permanent body that the international community has to negotiate disarmament matters multilaterally. In recent years, the General Assembly has adopted various resolutions with a view to revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament. Spain has participated actively in these debates, which, among other matters, have addressed

reforming the Conference's rules of procedure and options to regulate the use of the consensus rule.

The paralysis in the Conference on Disarmament cannot be attributed exclusively to structural problems in that negotiating forum, given that in the past it contributed to significant achievements in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. In our view, this is more due to a lack of political will to move forward decisively with negotiations on a multilateral basis. The legitimate national security interests of each State should not be imposed as prerequisites, but rather they should be elements to bring up during the negotiating process.

We should not give way to discouragement as a result of a stalemate that has gone on for too long already. Disarmament takes time, and perseverance is required. Furthermore, the panorama is not all negative. In the past year important steps forward have been taken in disarmament and arms control, such as the entry into force of the Arms Trade Treaty and the signing of the Protocol to the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia.

When it comes to the Conference on Disarmament, I should like to highlight the work of the Informal Working Group over the past year to develop a programme of work. We would like the Group to continue to meet next year in order to achieve its objective.

Spain would like to see the resumption of the long-delayed negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty. That, without a doubt, would be the best sign of the revitalization of the disarmament machinery. Spain welcomes the constructive results of the two meetings of the Group of Governmental Experts held last year. We would also like to remind the Committee that the programme of work set out in document CD/1864, approved in 2009 by consensus, has not yet been carried out. In our opinion, that is one of the tangible instruments that we can use as a reference point for how to proceed.

For our delegation, all negotiations on nuclear disarmament should involve the active participation of all nuclear-weapon States. For that reason, we believe that setting up parallel forums to the Conference on Disarmament where potential nuclear Powers are absent is not the best way to move forward towards a world without nuclear weapons. Spain has closely followed the work of the Open-ended Working Group set up to look into possible issues related to multilateral

negotiations on nuclear disarmament, but our position of principle has not been altered.

In the current context of stalemate in the disarmament machinery, all concrete proposals should be taken up with the greatest attention and a constructive spirit. That will always be the approach of my delegation. However, the current situation requires that any new initiative take into account available resources without generating extra budget costs.

I do not want to conclude without mentioning the importance that Spain's security and disarmament policy attaches to the central role of the United Nations in this field. We believe that disarmament institutions have to be open to favour the participation of States. Spain therefore supports the efforts undertaken to expand the Conference on Disarmament, as well as greater participation in the structures of the working groups and groups of governmental experts nominated by the Secretary-General, so as to favour interaction among all Member States.

Mr. Seck (Senegal) (*spoke in French*): In reiterating our appreciation of your guidance of our work, Sir, I should like at the beginning of my comments to reaffirm that Senegal remains attached to effective multilateral disarmament that enables the creation of conditions for a safer world. Indeed, the paralysis that has seized the disarmament machinery of the United Nations explains the dysfunctionality of a certain number of multilateral treaties, including the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

We remember that the 2010 NPT Review Conference was considered as a relative success, as it was not able to reach consensus on the measures needed to strengthen the non-proliferation regime. We also saw the blockage relating to the project to hold a conference in 2012 on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems, which did not take place. The same feeling of powerlessness is something we feel concerning the negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament on a cut-off treaty for fissile material for military use, in spite of some progress that has been made.

As the main multilateral body on issues of disarmament, the Conference on Disarmament plays a crucial role in the maintenance of international peace and security, and therefore it should not meet with any impasse. Essentially there is a lack of political will because those entities have all the necessary elements

in order to accomplish their mission. This situation is therefore a source of frustration, as the disarmament process must conform to strong political will in order to stop the risk of conflicts and disasters connected with weapons and related military facilities.

To be committed, therefore, should be an act of faith, even more so because if there is a lack of confidence among the members and a lack of flexibility in their respective positions that may further impede the work of the Conference on Disarmament. Moreover, the rules of procedure, and specifically the rule of consensus, constitutes another element leading to the impasse in the Conference on Disarmament and the United Nations Disarmament Commission, which after four cycles have not been able, as directed by the General Assembly, to draft recommendations for nuclear disarmament and confidence-building measures related to conventional weapons.

While consensus is a desirable means of decision-making, other, alternative methods must be envisaged in order to overcome possible blockages. The trap to be avoided is that certain parties whose position is far from that of the majority could have some type of veto power, which would be detrimental to achieving a common decision.

In spite of everything I have mentioned, we reiterate firmly that a solution should be able to be found within the Conference on Disarmament, which is the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, unless the General Assembly decides otherwise during a special session under the revitalization and reform of disarmament entities, which certain members are ever more insistently calling for.

Concerning conventional weapons, the future entry into force of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), on 24 December, demonstrates perfectly that multilateralism in disarmament can have a specific result. While its adoption was not one of consensus, the upcoming implementation of the ATT less than two years after its opening for signature, in June 2013, shows the interest of Member States for the regulation of trade, and also for the prevention of illicit trafficking. That action will be complementary to the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

I should like to conclude my comments by urging Member States to strengthen their synergistic actions

so that we can achieve our common goal, specifically a world of peace free of all weapons of mass destruction.

Ms. Anderson (Canada) (*spoke in French*): Earlier this year, the Secretary-General remarked that functional disarmament machinery must contribute substantially to international peace and security. Unfortunately, neither of the two main multilateral forums established to advance disarmament have met that test this year. It has been argued that the deadlock reflects the current political climate. Each of us must deal with geopolitical power struggles, and no country will emerge a winner from these. These forums were established so that other representatives of the countries affected would be able to discuss their common interests in stability and international security. Instead, we see these interests undermined by bickering in the Conference on Disarmament (CD) and the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC).

Canada welcomes with satisfaction the dialogue initiated by the Chair of the United Nations Disarmament Commission to seek to revitalize its work. We support several of the proposals he has put forward, and we hope that this will enable a rapid increase in the necessary goodwill to enable the UNDC to fulfil its mandate.

The Informal Working Group of the Conference on Disarmament has given delegations an opportunity to seriously discuss the potential for drafting a consensus programme of work. Nevertheless, it was unable to generate a sufficient spirit of cooperation, flexibility and compromise to end the ongoing deadlock. Although during the schedule of activities certain delegations were able to discuss with each other and not just have monologues, we cannot overestimate its value. That is only one small step in the right direction. The adoption of a programme of work is still improbable. The CD remains no closer to resuming any substantive negotiations.

(*spoke in English*)

Canada appreciates the efforts of the Acting Secretary-General of the CD to break the deadlock. We will continue to explore the merits of the Acting Secretary-General's proposals, in particular those relating to a potential reform of the rules of procedure. Canada was encouraged by the discussion within the CD of banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. That discussion, aided by the work under way in the Group of Governmental Experts, demonstrated to us

that positions are not so far apart and that negotiations on a treaty should be within reach. Unfortunately, that was not the conclusion reached by all States. One notably chooses to block treaty negotiations while continuing to produce fissile material for nuclear weapons.

Moreover, there remain those who continue to insist on framing the question of scope as an overly simplistic choice between an "all stocks" and a "no stocks" option. This dichotomy is unnecessary and unhelpful, and fails to account for a wider range of potential scope scenarios on which the views of the majority of States are likely to overlap.

Canada is confident that the detailed technical assessment of the aspects of a treaty currently being undertaken by the Group of Governmental Experts can unpack some of these questions and contribute to setting the stage for eventual negotiations on a treaty itself. The Group of Governmental Experts will not negotiate a treaty nor resolve all the thorny issues, but it can provide signposts to guide future negotiators through its final report and recommendations. We are very pleased by the constructive spirit guiding the work of the Group of Governmental Experts to date, and we are confident that it will reach a positive conclusion. However, I must emphasize that the useful work of the Group of Governmental Experts does not diminish our impatience to see meaningful negotiations on a treaty begin at the earliest possible date.

In conclusion, we focus a great deal on the absence of concrete progress resulting from the inability of the disarmament machinery to function. However, that has another, perhaps more insidious effect. We have not only stopped achieving substantive outcomes, we may have also stopped listening to each other. As we remain locked in a static and mundane debate in these bodies, we have lost both the importance and nuance of the issues we are addressing. In so doing, we risk losing sight of what is practical and realistically achievable. We have stopped working for the common good and aim only for what we, in our respective national interests, narrowly perceive as the best.

In such a frame of mind no one's priorities will be met. Let us hope we can find a way in the coming year to better live up to the needs and expectations of the international community.

Mr. Schmid (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): The international community faces multiple global security challenges that require cooperative, multilateral

solutions. In that context, we remain concerned at the paralysis in the disarmament machinery and continue to see a pressing need for progress in revitalizing these forums.

That applies first and foremost to the prolonged stalemate affecting the Conference on Disarmament (CD). We are firmly convinced of the fundamental importance of a properly functioning CD that is capable of fulfilling its mandate as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. Moreover, we consider it essential to preserve the disarmament community established around the CD in Geneva, as this constitutes a unique centre of expertise in matters of disarmament and arms control. Overcoming the impasse in that forum will constitute an ongoing priority, as failure to do so will result in further damage to its standing. While regretting that the CD was once again unable to resolve the stalemate affecting it during the past session, we are nevertheless encouraged that it is seeking to explore various options in order to overcome that impasse.

The schedule of activities adopted by the CD for its 2014 session has led to substantive, intensive and high quality exchanges. In some instances it has allowed us to clarify national positions further. The re-establishment of an Informal Working Group charged with producing a programme of work has provided an opportunity for close examination of a number of considerations that should be built upon next year. In that context, we believe that it would be appropriate not just for the CD to continue its efforts through the Informal Working Group and the schedule of activities in 2015, but also it should ensure that it does not begin its work all over again but builds on the achievements of 2014.

We also welcome the suggestions submitted by the Acting Secretary-General of the CD. While we consider it opportune for the Conference to explore the possibility of negotiating framework agreements or politically binding instruments, we believe it is even more imperative to follow up the suggestion of examining the working methods and functioning of the Conference. We believe that this type of work has been delayed for too long. Establishing a dedicated structure was an issue last addressed in 1994. Establishing a structured process to consider the various aspects of this question should therefore be a priority for the Conference at the start of the 2015 session.

Concerns related to the paralysis of the disarmament machinery are not restricted to the CD. We are equally concerned at the lack of progress in the

United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC), which has completed a new triennial cycle without agreeing substantive recommendations. Considerations that have to be undertaken within the UNDC are therefore welcome. In particular, we share the opinion that that body should be given a more focused agenda, an approach that could facilitate progress in this body.

With respect to both the CD and the UNDC, we consider it high time that these forums open up more fully to the contributions of civil society. The United Nations disarmament machinery has not taken account of important developments affecting the multilateral world, and in the way it operates cuts itself off from both public opinion and considerable expertise.

Finally, relating to the disarmament machinery, I welcome the excellent work carried out by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, whose work is essential to the disarmament community. Furthermore, I take this opportunity to thank Director Theresa Hitchens for her commitment over the course of her mandate in ensuring that the institution remains a priority in the long term future. We are certainly committed to efforts undertaken with that in mind.

The General Assembly on several occasions has underlined the importance it attaches to the revitalization of the CD and the disarmament machinery as a whole. As already mentioned by my colleagues from the Netherlands and South Africa, resolution 66/66, entitled "Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations", has sought to reach a consensus among all States Members of the United Nations on the need to continue to make progress in this area. We hope that members of the CD will continue to move forward on the basis of the elements introduced by the resolution. We will again monitor progress in the implementation of the aims of the resolution next year, and will consider ways of taking them forward.

Mr. Mana (Cameroon) (*spoke in French*): Cameroon attaches the highest importance to international peace and security, specifically through disarmament, non-proliferation and the control of all types of weapons, and consequently to the work of the First Committee, the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) and the Conference on Disarmament (CD). That is why my delegation welcomes the renewed commitment of Member States and other stakeholders for general and complete disarmament, a position that has largely been

expressed throughout the general debate, in spite of certain dissensions with regard to certain items.

Currently in the framework of the thematic debate on disarmament machinery, my delegation would like to make a statement specifically under sub-item (h) of agenda item 97, entitled “Activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”. My delegation takes the floor in order to talk about the security challenges facing Central Africa, as well as the measures that it is taking to deal with those challenges. I also take the floor to call for as broad a support as possible for the draft resolution (A/C.1/69/L.58) related to this item.

In a world that is characterized by all kinds of conflicts, Central Africa faces multifarious security challenges — open domestic political crises, latent or low-intensity conflicts, post-conflict situations with residual violence, and others — all of it in an environment with porous borders and the existence of large spaces that are ethnically or culturally homogenous, which encourages the circulation of weapons and ideologies and constitutes lawless areas and theatres for trafficking and other illicit activities of all types.

The circulation of weapons is one of the major security challenges for the subregion. Faced with that phenomenon, the countries of Central Africa three years ago adopted the Central African Convention for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons, their Ammunition, Parts and Components that can be used for their Manufacture, Repair and Assembly, a regional instrument that should perfectly interlink with the brand new Arms Trade Treaty, a universal instrument, the entry into force of which is scheduled for December, and on which Central Africa is pinning great hopes.

The fire of the Great Lakes region has barely been put out, but the situation of chronic instability in the Central African Republic and the Libyan crisis have contributed to a great increase in the circulation of small arms and light weapons, and even heavy weapons.

States of the region also adopted a road map on counter-terrorism and the non-proliferation of weapons in December 2011. That was followed by two workshops dedicated to the assessment of the progress that had been made, organized, respectively, in Libreville in January 2014 and in Bujumbura last April. Beyond seeking a solution to the situation in the Central African Republic, Member States also worked for the

adoption of measures such as the Kigali Declaration of 23 August 2013, and Security Council resolutions 2121 (2013), 2127 (2013), 2134 (2014) and 2149 (2014). The disarmament, demobilization and reintegration work of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic that is being carried out in the field is part of many of the measures adopted.

Chronic insecurity encourages the maintenance or emergence of lawless areas that are ripe for the development of illicit activities in the mining sector and the looting of wildlife resources. Specifically concerning poaching and the illicit trafficking of animal species, which affect security, States in the region, at the initiative of Gabon and associated with Germany, held two high-level meetings in New York at the margins of the sixty-eighth and sixty-ninth sessions of the General Assembly.

Beyond internal crises, Central Africa, and specifically the coast along the Gulf of Guinea, has fallen prey to acts of maritime piracy and other acts of armed robbery at sea. Working with the Economic Community of West African States, the Heads of State of member States of the Economic Community of Central African States adopted, within the framework of the Summit of Heads of State and Government on Maritime Safety and Security in the Gulf of Guinea on 25 June 2013, the Yaoundé declaration, which contains a common strategy to combat piracy. My country is honoured to host the operational structure for the implementation of the strategy, which is the Inter-Regional Coordination Centre for Maritime Security in the Gulf of Guinea inaugurated in Yaoundé on 11 September, the operation of which requires significant financing. In that regard, in addition to their national efforts, the countries of Central Africa know that they can count on the support of the international community.

My delegation appeals to the international community, the Secretary-General and the United Nations Office for Central Africa and all partners of goodwill to show continued support so that the Advisory Committee can pursue its activities in support of the national efforts of Central African States in combating the security challenges that they face. That is the subject of a draft resolution that the Central African Member States submit each year to the First Committee on this agenda item.

In conclusion, terrorism, like all transnational phenomena, does not respect conventional borders.

At the western border of the entity known as Central Africa, armed terrorist groups, guided by leaders whose beliefs are of another era but who are technologically connected to our century, have for several years been involved in hostage-taking and the looting and killing of civilian populations on so-called religious grounds. In the coming days, Central Africa will certainly need the United Nations in order to deal with that phenomenon.

The Chair: Before giving the floor to the next speaker, may I remind delegations to limit their interventions to five minutes when speaking in a national capacity.

Mr. Moura (Portugal): Portugal fully aligns itself with the statement delivered by the observer of the European Union (see A/C.1/69/PV.2) on the disarmament machinery thematic discussions. However, allow me to add some remarks regarding a specific issue of particular relevance to my country.

Portugal strongly believes that a non-discriminatory, fully inclusive and multilateral approach remains essential in addressing globally shared concerns related to disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation. By adopting resolutions 66/59, 67/72 and 68/64, just to name a few, the General Assembly clearly reiterated that fully inclusive multilateral negotiation mechanisms constitute in themselves a major prerequisite for effective and universal progress for achieving long and sustained peace and security.

We remain deeply concerned by the fact that those unquestionable principles continue year after year not being respected or implemented in the framework of an essential part of the United Nations disarmament machinery: the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament (CD). During the past 15 years, the Conference on Disarmament, the single United Nations negotiating forum, has not produced any decision regarding its enlargement to States that legitimately require membership, which should be mandatory in accordance with its own rules of procedure.

Year after year, the First Committee reaches consensus in expressing its dissatisfaction regarding that anomalous and unacceptable situation through the adoption of the annual draft resolution on the report of the CD. However, also year after year, the legitimate aspiration of United Nations Members to become State parties to the Conference continues to be, in practical terms, frustrated. Any kind of divisive perception of States in addressing concerns such as disarmament,

non-proliferation and arms control issues that are shared by all, is not acceptable. States must not only engage one with another in searching for the best possible solutions, but also they must not prevent others from contributing to the discussion of issues that matter to all.

The issue of the enlargement of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament has had no satisfactory solution since the Conference was established, in 1979. According to rule 2 of its rules of procedure the CD, should review its membership at regular intervals. However, only twice have proposals on effective enlargement achieved consensus since 1979 — in 1996, when 23 countries joined the CD, and in 1999, when five other States were admitted.

Those two enlargements were preceded by broad international pressure leading to the adoption by the General Assembly of consecutive resolutions that tackled the issue. All of those resolutions addressed solely the issue of the CD membership. In that regard, Portugal strongly regrets that no reference was made in the latest Conference on Disarmament report to the nomination of the Friend of the Chair for the enlargement of the CD's membership. Moreover, the informal group of observer States to the CD has repeatedly — and I underline repeatedly — asked for the appointment of a special rapporteur tasked with examining the enlargement modalities of the Conference without any prejudice to the outcome. We cannot but regret the lack of ability of the CD to pursue that request up to now.

The Conference on Disarmament is in a persistent and frustrating deadlock. Portugal firmly believes that a positive decision on the enlargement of the CD membership would help in setting a constructive new momentum to the general environment of the negotiations. Indeed, the CD until now is likely to be assessed more by what it cannot do or decide rather than for its past achievements. The credibility of the CD rests on its capacity to produce decisions on all the different matters under its consideration. Despite its long-lived deadlock, the fact that a significant number of States continue to express their interest in joining the Conference is a powerful political statement on the continued relevance of the Conference.

As stated in the CD's report to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session,

“The Conference on Disarmament has a unique character and importance as the single multilateral

disarmament negotiating body, and it is important that it continues to discharge its substantive responsibilities.”

Portugal hopes that the discussions and deliberations at this First Committee session under your chairmanship, Sir, will be fruitful, including in addressing the urgent need for the enlargement of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. Rowland (United Kingdom): As this is the first time that I take the floor in a formal meeting, let me take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Chair, on your assumption of the role and to assure you of my delegation’s full support for your work.

Let me also align the United Kingdom with the statement made under this cluster on behalf of the European Union and its member States.

It is good to hear so many States reaffirming their support for the United Nations disarmament machinery, and their willingness to revitalize and reinvigorate its component bodies. The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD-I) (resolution S-10/2) is clear that disarmament is the responsibility of all States. The United Kingdom adds its voice to those reaffirming their support for the machinery, and shares the objective of its revitalization. The mandates of the bodies of the United Nations disarmament machinery as envisaged by the first special session are as relevant today as they were in 1978. If the disarmament machinery is to be truly effective, however, it does need to be revitalized.

All three forums — the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the First Committee and the Conference on Disarmament (CD) — are mutually reinforcing. We believe that a reinvigoration of any one of the bodies will have a positive effect on the others. We have the ideal opportunity now, at the end of the Disarmament Commission’s current three-year cycle, not only to refresh its agenda but also to consider changes to its working practices. In that regard, we welcome the excellent work instigated by the Disarmament Commission’s Chair, Ambassador Drobnjak. We fully support those efforts aimed at revitalizing the Commission, and hope to see them reflected in a consensus draft resolution here later this month.

If the Disarmament Commission can discuss new agenda items or emerging threats to international security, it can help revitalize the First Committee. To make space for the consideration of new items on the

programme of the First Committee, we might identify more draft resolutions that could be considered on a biennial or triennial basis. Draft resolutions dealt with in that way are no more or less important than the draft resolutions considered annually.

We share the frustration of others that the Conference on Disarmament has not been able to agree a programme of work since 1996. The United Kingdom applauds the leadership of Australia and Ecuador and their efforts in the Informal Working Group to find a way to overcome the impasse. Our priority at the CD remains the negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty. Ceasing the production of the fissile material required to make nuclear weapons is an obvious and necessary step towards disarmament.

The Final Document of SSOD-I goes on to say that

“While disarmament is the responsibility of all States, the nuclear-weapon States have the primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament and, together with other militarily significant States, for halting and reversing the arms race.” (*resolution S-10/2, para. 28*)

The United Kingdom recognizes its particular responsibilities as a nuclear-weapon State. The lack of movement in the disarmament machinery has not been used by the United Kingdom as an excuse to stop taking steps towards disarmament. The United Kingdom remains committed to the goal of a world without nuclear weapons. In the past five years, we have announced further reductions in warhead numbers, and revised and strengthened our negative security assurances. We have reduced our holdings of nuclear weapons from around 460 warheads to a commitment now of 180 warheads by the mid-2020s. Within the disarmament machinery, the United Kingdom was pleased this year to have taken on the role of coordinator of the informal discussions on item 3 of the CD’s agenda — “Prevention of an arms race in outer space” — thus making a small contribution aimed at getting the CD back to work.

The paragraph of the Final Document of SSOD-I that I have quoted, which identifies that the nuclear-weapon States have the primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament, concludes by saying that it is important to secure the active participation of the nuclear-weapon States. The United Nations disarmament machinery provides the necessary framework for doing just that. But the right machinery cannot deliver by itself. The other indispensable ingredient for further reductions in

nuclear weapons is trust between the nuclear-weapon States. Trust is an essential requirement for security and for further disarmament. It is the lubricant for the United Nations disarmament machinery, and the machinery, however good, cannot function properly without it.

The United Kingdom will continue to support the United Nations disarmament machinery and will continue to work to build the trust among the nuclear-weapon States that will permit the machinery to deliver the further reductions in nuclear weapons that we seek.

Ms. Kasnakli (Turkey): Turkey, like many other delegations in this room, shares the concern vis-à-vis the continuous stalemate that persists in the United Nations disarmament machinery. The Conference on Disarmament (CD) has remained dormant for too long now. The same, unfortunately, applies to the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Against that backdrop, Turkey is convinced that the approach of multilateralism and progressive interaction among States carry sufficient ways and means towards rectifying the ailing components of the machinery.

The international community faces a multitude of security challenges today. Enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations disarmament machinery, as well as the relevant institutions and mechanisms, should be a shared objective. Therefore, there is inevitably the necessity for a collective response. Nevertheless, one should keep in mind that this very mechanism has in the past been successful in producing tangible outcomes. It is time to rekindle collective efforts to revitalize the whole mechanism.

As for the CD, Turkey believes that the problems that hamper progress are not created by its procedures or its internal dynamics. We have to acknowledge that there is a certain malaise throughout the disarmament forums and machinery. The stalemate in the CD is a reflection of the strategic bottlenecks at different yet interrelated levels. We need to see the larger picture, and not to assess the work of the CD in abstraction from the rest of the disarmament efforts.

Certainly, the resumption of the substantive work of the CD with the consent of all its members will contribute to the improvement of all international efforts towards nuclear disarmament. To that end, we see the need urgently to formulate a consensual programme of work. That will pave the way towards the commencement of negotiations. It is our conviction

that only then will the CD be revitalized. We should not spare any effort within the CD that would generate more mutual understanding and confidence, while not ignoring the developments outside the CD. As part of those efforts, we welcome the re-establishment of the Informal Working Group.

Turkey is convinced that the Conference possesses the mandate, rules of procedure and membership to discharge its duties. At this stage, we need progress — and we need it fast. It is our wish that we do not diffuse our focus on the main substantive issue by introducing into our deliberations additional points of contention that do not command consensus. We are clearly not against an expansion of the membership, but rather concerned about the timing.

We also take into account the fact that discussions in the CD are conducted in an inclusive manner. We hope the time to consider this issue comes sooner rather than later.

Unfortunately, another important pillar of the United Nations disarmament machinery that has not functioned as we would have desired is the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC). Despite the fact that it is a deliberative body, the UNDC once successfully formulated consensus principles, guidelines and recommendations on a number of subjects. Now, regrettably, the UNDC has not submitted any substantive recommendations to the General Assembly in the course of the past 15 years. We are therefore of the opinion that the revitalization of the work of the UNDC is crucial in its upcoming triennial cycle.

The First Committee, on the other hand, remains as a significant component of the disarmament machinery. Turkey values the institution of introducing draft resolutions. Nevertheless, we believe the international community needs to be mindful about not creating a self-imposed maze of duplication through the resolutions we draft. To that end, Turkey believes that, if needed, we should be in a position to consider some flexibility so as to be able to make the necessary consensual amendments to the contents of the draft resolutions, as well as the timetable of introducing them.

In conclusion, let me reiterate our call for solidarity and cooperation. There may be challenges ahead, but despairing is not the way to overcome them. Striving to bring about change through mutual understanding and progress is.

Mr. Moktefi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): I should like to begin by congratulating you, Sir, on the calm way in which you have undertaken this work in the most effective way possible. Given the importance of this topic and the stakes relating to the issues pertaining to the disarmament machinery, my delegation would like to take the floor in this thematic debate and express its position on these questions.

Algeria aligns itself fully with the statement made earlier by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

My delegation took note of the reports and statements made in the panel on the disarmament machinery. Algeria remains strongly committed to multilateral disarmament agendas and strengthening disarmament machinery. Given the stalemate that the machinery finds itself in, it is important that Member States demonstrate political will to revitalize these disarmament tools in an efficient and lasting way. In that context, it is important to preserve the nature, role and mandate of each component element of this important United Nations disarmament machinery, even if we do need to improve the efficiency of those bodies. While each of the tools faces similar challenges, it is still the lack of political will that is the principal obstacle to making progress towards achieving concrete results.

My delegation expresses its regret and disappointment that the United Nations Disarmament Commission has been unable during its triennial cycle 2012-2014 to produce concrete recommendations on the two items on its agenda. More than ever, it is now clear that a lack of political will is the cause of the stalemate that has led the Commission not to be able to fulfil its mandate. Despite that fact, my delegation reaffirms its confidence in the Disarmament Commission and its mandate as the only specialized deliberative body in the framework of the United Nations disarmament machinery.

Algeria continues to attach great importance to the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, given the critical importance of the issues on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. My delegation expresses its deep concern at the lack of consensus in adopting a programme of work as set out by the General Assembly. The stalemate affects particularly those countries that do not possess nuclear weapons.

Algeria believes that the stalemate cannot be attributed to shortcomings in the institutional mechanism. It is due neither to the way in which the mechanism works nor to its internal rules — namely, the rule of consensus — nor the items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. The consensus rule is a way of ensuring that Member States can protect their national security interests, and not just the most powerful nations.

In any case, Algeria is committed to contributing constructively with all Member States to the disarmament agenda and to seeking all paths to revitalize and strengthen the disarmament mechanism. On this occasion, my delegation reiterates its support for the convening of a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. That would be an opportunity to look at the issue of disarmament with a view to establishing a new consensus on disarmament priorities and to restate the purposes of the disarmament mechanisms within the United Nations.

Mr. Ahn Young-jip (Republic of Korea): Today, my delegation would like mainly to focus on the Conference on Disarmament (CD) and the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC).

Despite the negotiation of a number of milestone treaties over the years, the Conference on Disarmament has remained unable to produce substantial work for more than a decade. Frustrated with the lack of progress, the international community continues to urge the disarmament machinery to change, and the members to overcome the political dynamics affecting its dismal performance. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon also added his voice to those concerns during the opening plenary meeting of the 2014 session (see A/69/PV.6), calling upon the Conference to make progress towards the resumption of substantive negotiations in order to revalidate the relevance of the Conference.

This year, as many delegations have already pointed out today, we have witnessed some signs of improvement. In response to international calls for progress, the members of the CD embarked on several initiatives designed to renew action. During the 2014 session, the Conference re-established the Informal Working Group to discuss possible options for a programme of work, and also conducted informal discussions on each agenda item according to the schedule of activities. Those serious efforts demonstrated the strong commitment of CD members to revitalize that forum.

We believe that CD members will be able to find a breakthrough for the current deadlock. It is our view that decision CD/1864, which was based on the Shannon mandate, provides a good basis for commencing negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty. While our priority is starting negotiations on this issue, we do not exclude the possibility of finding ways to further boost the CD with discussions on other agenda items. In particular, the Informal Working Group seems to be a very useful practice. We believe that such innovative efforts and contributions by CD members could eventually lead to more common ground upon which we can build.

At this critical juncture, all members of the CD are being called upon to do their best and to exhibit political will to overcome the prolonged stalemate, with a shared sense of urgency. My delegation sincerely hopes that the CD can translate all of the efforts made this year into concrete actions next year. Once Member States demonstrate a spirit of flexibility and cooperation, the Conference will be able to evolve in keeping with the rapidly changing disarmament climate and inject renewed impetus into the negotiating process. In that way the Conference can live up to the international community's expectations, proving once again its relevance as the disarmament machinery.

The work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission cannot be divorced from the overall nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation context in the international community. However, its continued failure to produce any recommendations means that it has not met expectations for concrete recommendations before the General Assembly in accordance with its mandate as a specialized and deliberative body. It is time for us to work together to revitalize the UNDC. Simply extending the three-year cycle without a meaningful outcome would endanger the *raison d'être* of the UNDC and undermine the credibility and authority of the multilateral disarmament machinery of the United Nations. In that sense, all Member States should focus on common denominators rather than on differences. Some outcomes may not satisfy all Member States, but an incremental agreement would be better than no agreement. Above all, what the Commission urgently needs is progress.

Let me conclude by reiterating the Republic of Korea's sincere hope that the UNDC will emerge from this prolonged impasse and once again play a unique role in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation.

It is a task that requires our collective wisdom and a shared sense of responsibility. We look forward to a fruitful outcome in the near future.

Mr. Luque Márquez (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): It is very pleasant to feel the warmth that has surrounded our deliberations this afternoon.

First of all, Ecuador aligns itself with the statements made earlier in this meeting by the representative of Suriname on behalf of the Union of South American Nations and the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Ecuador shares the concerns of other States relating to the current situation within the Conference on Disarmament (CD), which presents a dilemma: either we proceed with improvised initiatives that add only uncertainty and mistrust to the process, or we try to correct the problem as a whole. The proposals that are often presented through draft resolutions or other mechanisms, and which either in a murky or open way attempt to transfer issues relating to the Conference on Disarmament to other forums, often fall into the first category. They are often incomplete, biased and lacking in certainty in terms of the general objective of general and complete disarmament. As far as we are concerned, it is clear that the stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament, a body that has given important instruments to the international community, is due to a lack of political will by the main political actors to achieve agreements that accord all issues the importance they merit, without subordinating or marginalizing any.

The solution is not simply going to be found through a change in rules or procedures or the working methods of the Conference, for such situations will be repeated absent a lack of political will by all actors. The solution must stem from bringing together positions within the Conference on Disarmament in such a way as to ensure that the concerns of Member States are dealt with in transparent negotiations, including all outstanding issues and following up with good faith and in a responsible way the principle of consensus, which underlies the work of the Conference. We should recall that consensus in negotiations on disarmament is based on the principle of security, without undermining the security of anyone.

We welcome the progress made this year, during which numerous innovative proposals have been made to try to make progress on negotiations on the

four crucial subjects on the programme — nuclear disarmament, fissile material, preventing an arms race in outer space, and negative security assurances — as well as a potential negotiation on biological weapons. We hope that we will continue to explore those matters next year in the Conference on Disarmament.

This year the United Nations Disarmament Commission has once again been unable to agree on recommendations on the subjects on its agenda, despite the efforts of the Chair and the coordinators of the working groups, for which we are grateful. We trust that, given enough political will from all actors, the cycle beginning in 2015 will be able to produce a more targeted agenda that preserves the priority of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament, and that we will be able to make concrete recommendations.

I should make it clear that Ecuador does not propose that the current structures within the disarmament machinery be frozen in time forever. What we want is for the rules and the bodies that we have to be respected until we manage to convene a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, as has been a constant request from my country, so that all the bodies within the disarmament machinery can be examined as a whole and respective corrective measures can be adopted.

In conclusion, we often hear the call from certain forums to be imaginative when it comes to tackling questions relating to disarmament. Let us indeed be imaginative, but let us also be brave and convene a fourth special session devoted to disarmament where all Members of the United Nations can come to a new consensus on the disarmament mechanisms we want to ultimately fulfil the promise behind the United Nations since its foundation: a world without weapons, in peace and security for all.

Mr. Ellinger (Czech Republic): As this is the first time that I take the floor, allow me to express my delegation's sincere congratulations to you, Sir, on your election as Chair of the First Committee at this session, as well as to the other members of the Bureau. You can rest assured of our cooperation and support.

The Czech Republic fully supports the statement delivered on behalf of the European Union (see A/C.1/69/PV.2). It is my honour to draw the Committee's attention to the issues that are of particular importance to my country.

The Czech Republic has always been a supporter of the United Nations and of effective multilateralism. In order to achieve goals and meet the challenges in the field of international security, especially in disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control, we need a well-functioning and fully operational United Nations disarmament machinery — the role of which is, in our view, irreplaceable.

Unfortunately, one of the key components that plays a significant role in the whole machinery, the Conference on Disarmament (CD), has not been able to meet our expectations for more than a decade. We are frustrated by the continuing deadlock in that body and by its repeated failure to commence substantial disarmament negotiations. Like the vast majority of States Members of the United Nations, we have been expecting the commencement and early conclusion of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a legally binding treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. We regret that it has not been able thus far to deliver any tangible results to that end. We believe that such a treaty is long overdue and that, once it has entered into force, it will play a key role in the general disarmament and non-proliferation efforts as a third pillar complementing the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

That is why we supported the establishment of the Group of Governmental Experts, and our expert has actively participated in its work. We are convinced that the Group of Governmental Experts has undoubtedly the potential to bring us closer to the future treaty. We are also confident that the Group will present to the Secretary-General substantial and concrete recommendations that will make the future negotiators' task much easier. Any positive steps this Group could take towards the future treaty would carry a good message to the forthcoming 2015 NPT Review Conference.

We understand that launching negotiations is not feasible without consensus on adopting a programme of work for the CD. That is why we perceive the re-establishment of the Informal Working Group to assist in developing a programme of work as a positive step in the right direction. We also hope that sufficient time and effort will be devoted to the question of the enlargement of the Conference. That hope is in line with the rules of procedure of the CD, which provide

for the review of the membership question at regular intervals. It would be appropriate to pay more attention to that fact, as we believe that international stability and security — and disarmament — by definition constitutes a universal question that must be addressed by a universally represented body. As coordinator of the informal group of observer States to the Conference on Disarmament, the Czech Republic has done its best in that regard. Also in that vein, we reiterate our call for the appointment of a special coordinator who could initiate the necessary debate on the topic of the enlargement of the Conference on Disarmament. We are convinced that the enlargement of the CD membership would promote transparency and inclusiveness of its work.

Mr. Gujubo Gutulo (Ethiopia): My delegation wishes to extend its gratitude to the Secretary-General for his reports on this important subject, and welcomes the increased interest of Member States in revitalizing our multilateral approach to conducting negotiations and reaching binding international agreements as a preferred universal tool.

Ethiopia fully aligns itself with the statement made earlier by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Ethiopia firmly believes that multilateralism remains the most reliable and effective setting in which to comprehensively and holistically address critical global issues of international peace and security, including disarmament. Indeed, continued multilateral engagement and negotiations are core instruments to effectively curb the proliferation of both conventional and non-conventional weapons, which have increasingly become a real threat to the preservation of world peace, security and stability. There are no viable options to multilateral binding agreements other than to use the already tested mechanisms that have been in place for many years now. Among other disarmament bodies, the Conference on Disarmament is the sole multilateral negotiating forum on a number of critical disarmament issues.

Nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction continue to challenge the peace and security of the globe, thereby making it necessary to expedite the revitalization of the disarmament machinery, particularly the Conference on Disarmament, so that it can begin its work without further delay. In that regard, the political will of individual States can of course make a significant difference, particularly as those

that possess nuclear weapons can play a positive role through tangible policy measures in the disarmament area. But as far as the United Nations is concerned, multilateralism should be a high priority to address international threats emanating from the use of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

Therefore, the global mandate is to have robust, effective and efficient multilateral mechanisms with appropriate machinery to take forward the negotiation process on nuclear disarmament, a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other explosive devices, the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and effective international arrangements to ensure a nuclear-free world with a clear time frame and concrete verification tools to effectively control possible threats of the use of nuclear and other deadly weapons.

It is evident that the revitalization of the multilateral disarmament machinery remains the top issue for almost all Member States, and that we all agree today that the world is under intense pressure from insecurity emanating mainly from the arms race among countries. As we speak about world security, the perceived or real threat of the use of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction by non-State actors, such as terrorist groups, are by no means put aside as an issue of lesser concern. The danger of nuclear weapons and their devices, if acquired by those groups or their extremist affiliates, would be catastrophic and unimaginable. That should not be allowed by any means. Therefore, the only safe alternative is the total elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction through multilateral, bilateral and trilateral negotiations.

Adhering to and strengthening international regimes of arms control and non-proliferation can be achieved only within the framework of the existing multilateral disarmament mechanisms, particularly the Conference on Disarmament, and it is important to enable that mechanism to begin work. It is not the right time to seek another disarmament forum. Ethiopia therefore strongly believes in maintaining and revitalizing the Conference on Disarmament, which is the single and proven multilateral forum that we have in our multilateral system today. In that regard, my delegation wishes to commend the efforts made by the President of the Conference on Disarmament this year to reach consensus on a programme of work. We also welcome the establishment of the Informal Working

Group with a mandate to produce a robust programme of work in a substantive and progressive way.

In conclusion, Ethiopia continues to remain committed to working with international and regional communities in all agreed and negotiated multilateral mechanisms. Strengthening international regimes of

arms control and non-proliferation can be achieved only within the framework of the existing multilateral disarmament mechanisms, particularly in the context of the sole and universal negotiating forum.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.