



General Assembly

Fifty-ninth session

First Committee

18th meeting

Wednesday, 27 October 2004, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chairman: Mr. De Alba (Mexico)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda items 57 to 72 (continued)

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

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to draw representatives' attention to Informal Paper No. 2/Rev.1, which contains the draft resolutions that were listed in Informal Paper No. 1 and on which we did not have an opportunity to reach decisions yesterday. It also contains the draft resolutions that appeared in Informal Paper No. 2, which was distributed yesterday. In other words, we have merged Papers No. 1 and No. 2 in order to put each subject in its proper thematic cluster.

If I hear no objection, we shall proceed in accordance with the order in which those drafts appear in Informal Paper No. 2/Rev.1, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.37. I should like to invite delegations, in particular the sponsors of draft resolutions or draft decisions, to report to the Chair as soon as possible as to whether there is any reason why those drafts cannot be considered today.

I now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolutions already adopted.

Mr. Mine (Japan): I have asked for the floor in order to explain the position of my Government on the

draft resolution entitled "Missiles", contained in document A/C.1/59/L.6/Rev.1, which was adopted yesterday.

The proliferation of missiles as delivery vehicles for weapons of mass destruction is a matter of grave concern to Japan, as we believe that it poses a threat to peace and stability in both the global and the regional contexts. For that reason, Japan has been making its own effort to ensure the non-proliferation of and to reduce the threat posed by those missiles. We also contributed to the discussions of the United Nations Panel of Governmental Experts on Missiles in All Their Aspects established by the Secretary-General, although the Panel was not able to reach consensus on the report.

Japan, however, abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.6/Rev.1. because it contains no explicit reference to concerns about the proliferation of missiles as delivery vehicles for weapons of mass destruction or any acknowledgement of ongoing non-proliferation efforts, such as the establishment and ongoing process towards the universalization of the Hague Code of Conduct, in which my country participates.

Regardless of our vote, we remain committed to the goal of ensuring the non-proliferation of such missiles while promoting international and regional peace and stability through a variety of means.

Ms. Martinic (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation has asked for the floor to comment on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.6/Rev.1, entitled "Missiles".

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

We should like first to comment on the work carried out by the Panel of Governmental Experts on Missiles in All Their Aspects at the three meetings held this year. Although the Panel was unable to reach consensus or adopt a report, the final draft that emerged from its discussions is a good basis for work that reflects in an adequate and balanced manner the various positions of the parties. That is why we should have preferred to extend the meetings of the Panel by another week in order to allow it to complete its work and submit a final report. The new panel should take as a basis and starting point for its work the achievements of the present Panel.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We wish to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/59/L.6/Rev.1, on missiles, and L.50, on the Hague Code of Conduct.

The Russian Federation has traditionally supported the resolution entitled "Missiles" and has voted in favour of it at this session as well. We have always believed that there is a need for comprehensive consideration of the problems related to missile proliferation, including issues concerning the various motivations involved, by all interested States on an equal footing. Therefore, we believe that the most appropriate forum for such work is the United Nations. That is the reason behind the Russian initiative to create a global control system for the non-proliferation of missiles and missile technologies.

We put forward such an approach in the context of the work of the two panels of governmental experts that were established in accordance with the resolutions on missiles. The success of the work of the first panel enabled us to hope that the second group would also conclude its work with the adoption of an agreed document. Unfortunately, that did not take place, both because of the complexity of the problem under consideration and for other reasons. However, the second panel of experts was able to make progress not only in considering the problem, but also in formulating practical proposals to resolve it. In our view, it would be a waste of time to lose that positive momentum and the relevant groundwork, although it has yet to take the form of a final report. Therefore, we believe there is a need to continue to study missile-related problems within the framework of the United Nations.

We hope that the work carried out by the panel of qualified consultants, with the participation of the

United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, to prepare a new report of the Secretary-General on missiles for the next session of the General Assembly will be successful. For our part, we wish to make a constructive contribution to the panel's forthcoming work.

The Russian Federation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.50, on the Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation, on the basis of our consistent policy regarding missile non-proliferation issues and because Russia is a party to the Code. We consider the adoption of the Code as the first real step towards countering the proliferation of ballistic missiles, which are delivery vehicles for weapons of mass destruction. It is clear that further practical steps in that area could include both universalization of the Code and gradual expansion of the sphere of coverage of this agreement and future agreements by all parties involved.

Accordingly, in keeping with our approach, we have supported amendments to the resolution that concern the role of the United Nations and the fact that the Code represents the first real step towards missile non-proliferation. We abstained in the vote on adding the word "development" for the technical reason that the draft resolution on the Hague Code of Conduct refers to a specific document, and that amendment has only indirect relevance to it.

During the current First Committee session, in our consideration of issues related to the further improvement of our work there has been no discussion of a proposal recommending that the sponsors of draft resolutions on similar or related subjects agree, whenever possible and in a timely manner, to combine such documents into a single draft. As we know, we have already had our first positive experience in that area. Accordingly, we believe it important that, in order to support and strengthen the multilateral aspect of our work, we also try to avoid taking any action that would pit various draft resolutions against others on similar subjects. That not only would reduce the effectiveness of the Committee's work; it would also prevent us from making progress in reaching decisions on key international security and disarmament issues.

Mr. Lew (Republic of Korea): I am taking the floor in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.6/Rev.1, entitled "Missiles".

My delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution. Following the first panel discussions, held

in 2001 and 2002, the Republic of Korea actively participated in the deliberations of the second panel of governmental experts on missiles this year. Regrettably, however, the panel was not able to reach a consensus for adopting a final report. In our view, that was due mainly to the fundamental differences among States in their perceptions and views concerning certain elements of missile-related issues. We do not believe that those differences will dissipate soon. Therefore, we believe it is premature to explicitly consider establishing another panel of governmental experts at this stage. For that reason, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote.

As I indicated at the beginning of the meeting, we shall proceed to consider the draft resolutions and draft decisions listed in Informal Paper No. 2/Rev.1, in the order in which they appear. Once again, I wish to remind delegations that sponsors of draft resolutions may make general statements at the beginning of the meeting or of our consideration of a cluster of subjects. However, in accordance with the rules, they cannot speak in explanation of vote either before or after the relevant decision has been taken.

Does any delegation wish to make a general comment on cluster 1, on nuclear weapons? I call on the representative of Israel.

Mr. Bar (Israel): The First Committee is called upon to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.37 entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East" — a draft resolution that is blatantly one-sided, contentious and divisive, and that undermines, rather than enhances, confidence between the States of the region.

Since the draft resolution was first introduced, many alarming developments have occurred that are directly related to the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. Some of those developments became apparent to the international community only recently, especially after the meetings last September and this of the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). In addition, other efforts are being made in the region to acquire weapons of mass destruction and missile capabilities, as our delegation pointed out during the general debate.

The bias of the draft resolution stems from its neglect of the fact that the real risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East emanates from countries that, despite being parties to international treaties, do not comply with their relevant international obligations. Those countries are engaged in ongoing efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles — efforts that have a destabilizing effect not only in the region but also on a global scale. The draft resolution chooses to ignore the internationally acknowledged evidence regarding States in the Middle East that join international arrangements but do not feel genuinely bound by them. The same States abuse the benefits of those arrangements in order to obtain nuclear technology for military purposes under a false pretext. The draft resolution also overlooks the profound hostility of States in the region towards Israel and their refusal to maintain any form of peaceful reconciliation and coexistence with Israel.

Adopting a draft resolution that does not reflect this reality will not serve the greater objective of curbing proliferation in the Middle East. Resolutions regarding the complex arms control problems in the Middle East should focus on objective ways to address them as they exist.

The draft resolution focuses entirely on one country that has never threatened its neighbours, nor abrogated its obligations under any disarmament treaty. Moreover, it singles out Israel in a manner that no other United Nations Member State is being singled out in the First Committee. Singling out Israel is counterproductive to confidence-building and peace in the region and does not give this body any credibility.

Israel's supreme objective is to achieve peace and security. Its non-proliferation and arms-control policy is aimed at supporting this objective. The constructive approach adopted by Israel over the years towards arms control and non-proliferation efforts was described in our statement in the general debate. It is best demonstrated by our attitude towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, despite substantive reservations regarding its modalities, and it is strongly undermined by the introduction of this biased draft resolution.

The fact that countries continue to lend a hand in such an abuse of reality and misuse of the United Nations is a source of deep disappointment to us.

The First Committee should not become a venue for political discrimination. We would like to call upon delegations to vote against the draft resolution.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): If no other delegation wishes to take the floor in explanation of vote under cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”, which includes draft resolutions A/C.1/59/L.37 and L.44, we will take action on the draft resolutions.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.37. A recorded vote has been requested.

A request has been made for a separate recorded vote on the sixth preambular paragraph. We will first take up the preambular paragraph and then proceed to the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the First Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.37, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the Committee’s 11th meeting, on 19 October 2004. The sponsors are listed in the document.

The Committee will now proceed to take a separate vote on the sixth preambular paragraph, which reads as follows:

“Recognizing with satisfaction that, in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Conference undertook to make determined efforts towards the achievement of the goal of universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, called upon those remaining States not parties to the Treaty to accede to it, thereby accepting an international legally binding commitment not to acquire nuclear weapons or nuclear explosive devices and to accept International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards on all their nuclear activities, and underlined the necessity of universal adherence to the Treaty and of strict compliance by all parties with their obligations under the Treaty”.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Mauritius, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 154 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the First Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.37 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Canada, Ethiopia, India, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Trinidad and Tobago

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.37 as a whole was adopted by 157 votes to 4, with 8 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.44. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.44, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 19 October. The sponsors are listed in the document. Nigeria and Mali have also become sponsors.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa,

Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mozambique, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.44 was adopted by 109 votes to none, with 61 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote on the resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Verma (India): India abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.37 as a whole and voted against the sixth preambular paragraph, as it believes that it is necessary to limit the focus of the draft to the region that it intends to address.

According to customary international law, as encapsulated in the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, States adhere to treaties considered to be in consonance with their national interests based on their freely exercised sovereign choice. The references to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in this draft resolution in the context of the

call for the universalization of the Treaty are at variance with this principle.

Notwithstanding its inability to support this draft resolution, India hopes that the draft will enable progress to be made in its principal focus in the coming years through positive contributions from the concerned States of the region.

Mr. Shaw (Australia): I take the floor to explain Australia's abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.37, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

Australia supports the establishment of an effectively verifiable Middle East zone free of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and means of delivery and, as a non-nuclear-weapon State, has consistently called on Israel to join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We have also been consistent in our support for the General Assembly resolution calling for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East freely arrived at among the States of the region.

Regrettably, however, we continue to have a number of substantial difficulties with the draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", notably its emphasis on the State of Israel, with no reference to other Middle Eastern States of nuclear proliferation concern.

In September, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Board of Governors, reflecting international concern about Iran's nuclear intentions, unanimously called on Iran to abide by its nuclear safeguard obligations and immediately suspend its uranium-enrichment programme. It is regrettable that the draft resolution makes no reference to the international community's serious concerns about this matter.

Australia is committed to preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and to the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world. As a strong supporter of the NPT, we will continue to promote these objectives at the 2005 NPT Review Conference and in all other international forums.

Mr. Lew (Republic of Korea): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.44, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear

weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons”.

As has been previously and repeatedly stated, it is the firm belief of my delegation that any non-nuclear-weapon State which is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and is in full compliance with all its obligations under the Treaty is entitled to be provided with full-fledged negative security assurances by the nuclear-weapon States. However, we do not believe that such negative security assurances would be of a nature to be provided to all non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT, regardless of their behaviour with respect to fulfilling their obligations under the Treaty. The draft resolution continues to fail to reflect this concern on the of our delegation. That is why we abstained in the voting.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We will now proceed to the second cluster, “Other weapons of mass destruction”.

We will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.12*. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.12*, entitled “Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Malaysia on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement at the Committee’s 11th meeting, on 19 October. The sponsors are listed in the document.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia,

Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Israel, Marshall Islands, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.12 was adopted by 165 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

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

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.16. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.16, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development,

Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Poland at the Committee’s 11th meeting, on 19 October. The sponsors are listed in the document.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution without a vote? If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.16 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Does any delegation wish to explain their vote or position on the draft resolutions in cluster 2, which we have just considered?

As I see none, we shall now proceed to consider cluster 3, “Outer space”. Does any delegation wish to make general comments or to explain their vote before we take action?

As there are none, we will therefore proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.36. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.36, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the Committee’s 12th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.36 and A/C.1/L.59/INF/2 and Add.1 and 2. Belarus has also become a sponsor.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt,

El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.36 was adopted by 167 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Does any delegation wish to explain their vote or position on this cluster?

If not, we shall now begin consideration of cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”, and draft decision A/C.1/59/L.48 in particular.

Does any delegation wish to make general remarks on this cluster, or to explain their position

before we take action on draft decision L.48, entitled “Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus”?

I understand that no delegation has requested a recorded vote. The draft decision is therefore adopted.

Draft decision A/C.1/59/L.48 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Unless a delegation wishes to explain its position on the draft decision just adopted, we will now begin consideration of cluster 5, “Regional disarmament and security”.

Does any delegation wish to make general remarks on this cluster or to explain its vote before we take action?

The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/59/L.46. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.46, entitled “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee’s 14th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.46, A/C.1/59/INF/2 and Add.3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia,

Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.46 was adopted by 165 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to delegations for statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

Mr. Verma (India): We take the floor to explain India’s vote against draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.46, on conventional arms control at the regional and subregional level.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission adopted by consensus, in 1993, guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security. We therefore do not agree that we need, at this juncture, to formulate principles for the framework for regional arrangements. Furthermore, India’s security parameters extend beyond south Asia. A resolution that sets about

applying regional security approaches to narrowly defined geographical regions is restrictive, from our standpoint. Finally, India cannot support the call for the Conference on Disarmament — a forum for negotiations of international instruments of global application — to consider the formulation of a principle for a framework for regional instruments on conventional arms control.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution contained in A/C.1/59/L.47. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.47, entitled “Regional disarmament”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee’s 14th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors are listed in the document.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of this draft resolution have indicated that they would like the Committee to adopt it without a vote. I take it that this is the desire of the Committee.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.47 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We will now proceed to consider the drafts in cluster 6, “Confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments”.

Do any delegations wish to make general remarks, or to explain their vote before the vote?

The Committee will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.3. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.3, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Equatorial Guinea at the Committee’s 15th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.3 and A/C.1/59/INF/2.

With the permission of the Chairman, I shall now read an oral statement in connection with that draft resolution.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.3, “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”, I wish to put on record the following statement on financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

“Under the terms of operative paragraphs 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 15 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would welcome the creation of a mechanism for the promotion, maintenance and consolidation of peace and security in Central Africa, to be known as the Council for Peace and Security in Central Africa (COPAX), by the Conference of Heads of State and Government of the member countries of the Economic Community of Central African States, held at Yaoundé on 25 February 1999, and would request the Secretary-General to give his full support to the effective realization of that important mechanism. It would emphasize the need to make the early warning mechanism in Central Africa operational so that it would serve, on the one hand, as an instrument for analysing and monitoring political situations in the States members of the Standing Advisory Committee with a view to preventing the outbreak of future armed conflicts and, on the other hand, as a technical body through which the member States would carry out the programme of work of the Committee, adopted at its organizational meeting held at Yaoundé in 1992, and would request the Secretary-General to provide it with the assistance necessary for it to function properly. The Assembly would request the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to continue to provide their full assistance for the proper functioning of the Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa; request the Secretary-General, pursuant to Security Council resolution 1197 (1998), to provide the States members of the Standing Advisory Committee with the necessary support for the implementation and smooth functioning of the Council for Peace and Security in Central Africa and the early warning mechanism; also request the Secretary-General to support the establishment of a network of parliamentarians with a view to the creation of a subregional parliament in Central Africa; and request the

Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to continue to provide increased assistance to the countries of Central Africa for coping with the problems of refugees and displaced persons in their territories. The Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to provide the States members of the Standing Advisory Committee with assistance to ensure that they are able to carry on their efforts.

“The activities of the Standing Advisory Committee — including those related to the implementation and functioning of the early warning mechanism and the Council for Peace and Security in Central Africa, referred to in operative paragraphs 6, 7 and 9 of the draft resolution, and those related to the establishment of a network of parliamentarians, referred to in operative paragraph 10 — are expected to be funded from voluntary contributions to the Trust Fund for the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa.

“Implementation of the activities related to the request contained in operative paragraph 11 of the draft resolution regarding increased assistance to the countries of Central Africa for coping with the problems of refugees and displaced persons in their territories would be subject to the availability of voluntary contributions to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

“Implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 15 regarding the provision of assistance to the States members of the Committee would be carried out within the resources already provided under section IV, “Disarmament”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2004-2005.

“Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.3, no additional requirements would arise in the programme budget for the biennium 2004-2005.”

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors have indicated that they would like the Committee to adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to proceed accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.3 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.52. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the First Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.52, entitled “Information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the Committee’s 15th meeting on 22 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.52 and A/C.1/59/INF/2 and Adds.2 and 3. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors: Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Gabon, Timor-Leste and Fiji.

With the permission of the Chairman, I shall now read out an oral statement in connection with that draft resolution.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.52, entitled “Information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms”, I wish to put on record the following statement on financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

“By operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to establish, with the financial support of States in a position to do so, an electronic database containing information provided by Member States and to assist them, at their request, in the organization of seminars, courses and workshops aimed at enhancing the knowledge of new developments in this field.

“Implementation of the request contained in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution regarding the establishment of an electronic database and the organization of seminars, courses and workshops on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms would be carried out only when sufficient extra-budgetary funding was received, in advance, from States in a position to provide financial support.

“Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.52, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2004-2005.”

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors have indicated that they would like the Committee to adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to proceed accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.52 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We shall now proceed to cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/59/L.27/Rev.1 and A/C.1/59/L.14 have requested that they be considered at a later meeting of the Committee. The Committee will therefore now take up only draft resolutions A/C.1/59/L.42*, L.9, L.18 and L.20.

I now call on representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Sanders (Netherlands): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.42*, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission". The candidate countries Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey and Croatia; the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and Serbia and Montenegro; and the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland and Norway, members of the European Economic area, align themselves with this explanation of vote.

The EU attaches special importance to the work of the Disarmament Commission. It is an important deliberative body aimed at promoting fruitful multilateral dialogue in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. However, the EU must express its deep disappointment that the Disarmament Commission has been unable to reach agreement on substantive agenda items for the current cycle. In our view, the Commission should adopt a more constructive and realistic approach to its next phase of work.

While the EU continues to support the Disarmament Commission, we believe that the failure to reach consensus on agenda items has rendered a disservice to it. It also shows the relevance of discussing efforts to enhance the work and working methods of the Commission.

The EU reaffirms its commitment to a successful outcome of the Disarmament Commission's work and to every possible effort to promote topical, concrete and useful recommendations. That is the reason why the EU supports draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.42.

Ms. Sanders (United States of America): Our delegation requests that the record of today's meeting show that the United States did not participate in the Committee's action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.42*, "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

Mr. Meyer (Canada): I wish to explain Canada's position on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.42*, "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

During our general and thematic debate, many lamented the sad state of the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery, particularly the Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission. In this Committee, we are actively engaged in improving the effectiveness of our work. It is Canada's hope that the Conference on Disarmament next year will be able to arrive at agreement on a programme of work. The United Nations Disarmament Commission can have an important role to play, making substantive and valuable contributions, as it has previously done.

Canada remains deeply disappointed at the failure of the Commission again this year to do any productive work, following several years of inability to agree upon the substantive report. That situation cannot continue, in our view. We remain concerned that, once again, the Committee has before it a draft resolution lacking recommendations on substantive issues for the Commission to take up next year at its three-week session. Such sessions involve considerable financial costs that must be assumed for United Nations services, although we have not even agreed on whether or not the Commission will have work to do.

Canada would like to see the Disarmament Commission return to a focus on substantive issues. However, next year, following in the reform mode of this Committee, it may be worthwhile for the Commission to devote its session to an examination and discussion of how it can play a more effective role and make the kind of contribution all would like to see. We regret that this could not take place this year. If the Disarmament Commission continues to be unable to even agree upon topics, much less upon a substantive

report, many countries will lose interest in attending its meetings, and its role and relevance will diminish.

We thus urge delegations to reflect actively on that in the coming weeks and to commit to having a useful discussion next year in the Commission about the Commission itself and its functioning. The First Committee could also discuss that next year as part of its thematic debate portion. That would not preclude a longer-term appraisal.

We simply cannot go on adopting these hollow draft resolutions without making an effort to come to grips with the underlying problems.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.42*. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/59/L.42*, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Georgia at the 15th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.42* and A/C.1/59/INF/2.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.42 was adopted.*

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.9. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.9, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Malaysia on behalf of the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.9 and A/C.1/59/INF/2.

I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the programme budget implications of this draft

resolution, which are set out in document A/C.1/59/L.57.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.9 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.9 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.18. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.18, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.18 and A/C.1/59/INF/2.

I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the programme budget implications of this draft resolution, which are set out in document A/C.1/59/L.59.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.18 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.18 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.20. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.20, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific". It was introduced by the representative of Nepal at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.20 and INF/2 and Add.3. Fiji also has become a sponsor of L.20.

I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the programme budget implications of this draft resolution, which are set out in document A/C.1/59/L.58.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.20 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.20 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I would now invite delegations wishing to explain their position after action has been taken to take the floor. They may do so on any of the resolutions under cluster 7.

Mr. Gala López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to make the following explanation with regard to draft resolution L.42, which has just been adopted without a vote.

It is regrettable that the United Nations Disarmament Commission has been unable this year even to begin considering substantive issues. My delegation played an active part in the informal consultations, which began at the start of this year. We tried to achieve a consensus on the agenda items for the substantive meeting in 2004. We actively supported the constructive proposals of items that were presented by the Non-Aligned Movement in a timely fashion and in keeping with the provisions set out in General Assembly decision 52/492. Regrettably, the text of draft resolution L.42 does not include any specific items in operative paragraph 5.

Cuba considers that the Disarmament Commission must be preserved as a specialized deliberating body within the multilateral disarmament machinery of the United Nations.

For our part, we reject the approach taken by certain delegations who said that the Commission cannot be effective until its present working methods are changed. In our opinion, no change in the working methods of this Commission could change the fact that there is a clear lack of political will on the part of certain countries to advance the multilateral approach to disarmament and, in particular, the question of nuclear disarmament.

Like other non-aligned countries, Cuba will continue to make an active, constructive contribution

to efforts being made to achieve a consensus on the items that should be on the agenda of the substantive session of the Disarmament Commission in 2005.

Mr. Issa (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its position on the report of the Disarmament Commission, which the Committee has just adopted.

We regret that the Member States of the United Nations have not responded to the positive and active efforts that the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) has undertaken since 2004, with a view to agreeing to the agenda of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Our delegation believes in the important role played by the Disarmament Commission in the framework of the United Nations disarmament mechanisms. We regret that the Commission's meetings were wasted in discussing procedural matters, despite the fact that NAM called for respecting, not squandering, those meetings.

We have requested that the Commission's work be suspended, in order to preserve the integrity of the meetings. We emphasize again the priority we attach to the continued activities of the Commission as the deliberative forum of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

I would just like to state that the delegation of Egypt, in the course of the interactive dialogue of the past two weeks, enquired about the possibility of being informed by this Committee of the resources to be set aside for the Conference on Disarmament. I hope to be informed of that.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Chair notes the request of the representative of Egypt. I ask the Secretariat to take that request into account in the not-so-distant future. I hope that can be done this week, preferably tomorrow.

We have completed consideration of cluster 7. We will now consider the draft resolutions which appear under cluster 8, "Other disarmament measures".

First, let me call on delegations that may wish to make general statements on any of the draft resolutions which appear under cluster 8. If there are no such statements, would any delegation like to make an explanation of vote or position before action is taken? Such explanation may refer to any draft that is under consideration. That does not appear to be the case.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.2/Rev.1. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.2/Rev.1, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation, at the 15th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors are listed in the document. In addition, Kyrgyzstan has now become a sponsor.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.2/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.5. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.5, entitled “National legislation on transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the 15th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsor is indicated in the document.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.5 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.51. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.51, entitled “United Nations Disarmament Information Programme”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 15th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.51 and

A/C.1/59/INF/2/Add.2. In addition, Estonia, France and Sierra Leone have become sponsors.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.51 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.10. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.10, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Malaysia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the Committee’s 15th meeting, on 22 October 2004. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.10 and A/C.1/59/INF/2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar,

Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.10 was adopted by 165 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.28. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.28, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Malaysia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.28 and A/C.1/59/INF/2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia,

Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

France, Israel.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.28 was adopted by 165 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.32. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.32, entitled "Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.32 and A/C.1/59/INF/2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany,

Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Chile, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Russian Federation, Samoa, South Africa, Tonga, Ukraine, Uruguay, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.32 was adopted by 101 votes to 49, with 17 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted under cluster 8.

Mr. Gala López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to clarify its position on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.5, entitled "National legislation on transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology", which has just been adopted without a vote.

First, we believe that it is only within the framework of legally binding, multilaterally negotiated treaties of universal and non-discriminatory scope that we can effectively guarantee strict international control over the transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technologies.

The existence of export control regimes based on selective and discriminatory criteria represents a serious obstacle to the realization of the inalienable right of all States to the peaceful use of existing means and technologies in the chemical, biological and nuclear fields.

Cuba believes that the most effective export and import control regime is one that is negotiated and implemented in a truly multilateral framework. Only broad and non-discriminatory participation in these controls can guarantee the effective achievement of the goals that are being pursued.

Multilateral efforts must be supplemented by measures adopted at the national level which strengthen the commitments entered into by States in the framework of the international treaties on disarmament and non-proliferation to which they are parties.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom is pleased to have been able to support draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.28, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". The report of the Group of Experts, which the draft acknowledges, contains many constructive recommendations that we support.

We welcome the mainstreaming of disarmament issues in development policy, particularly in the field of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons, and in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. We fully support the report's recommendations on small arms and light weapons. They are consistent with the United Nations Programme of Action on the subject, and we agree that there is a need for its 2006 Review Conference to consider the subject of small arms and light weapons transfers. We believe that the United Kingdom's transfer controls initiative has an important contribution to make in building consensus behind action in this area. We further support the report's recommendations concerning landmines and explosive remnants of war. We also agree with the report of the Group of Experts that there is no automatic link between disarmament and development, but that a complex relationship exists between the two.

However, we do not accept the report's suggestion that little evident progress is being made on nuclear disarmament. Nor do we accept that the integrity and effectiveness of the nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament regime is in doubt. The United Kingdom has made dramatic reductions in its nuclear weapons. We now have a minimum nuclear deterrent and we remain fully committed to our disarmament obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which has the widest membership of any arms control treaty and remains the cornerstone of the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

We also believe that the report does not give sufficient credit to unilateral, bilateral and multilateral actions in disarmament and non-proliferation. Such measures have brought and can bring positive results and their value is recognized in the arms control field, including in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

Ms. Sanders (United States of America): Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.10, the United States has previously made clear in this Committee that it sees no direct connection between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control agreements. We also remain unconvinced that this draft resolution is relevant to the work of the First Committee.

The United States believes that States parties to bilateral, regional or multilateral arms control and disarmament agreements should take relevant environmental concerns into account when implementing such agreements. The United States Government operates under stringent domestic environmental regulations, including in the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. Concern for the environment, however, should not lead us to overburden the crucial negotiation phase of crafting an agreement. Such agreements are difficult enough to negotiate without having to take into account factors that are not relevant to their central purpose. In addition, it should not be the role of the United Nations to attempt to set standards for the content of arms control and disarmament agreements. It is up to the parties to such agreements to choose the provisions by which they are willing to be bound.

This draft resolution has not changed in the last four sessions of the General Assembly. That suggests to us that draft resolution L.10 and its predecessors have not generated progress towards resolving the issues its sponsors wish to address. For that reason, and because of our continuing reservations about the appropriateness and utility of the draft resolution, the United States has voted against it.

The United States has also voted against draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.28, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". Our delegation continues to believe that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that do not lend themselves to being linked. It was for that reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. Accordingly, the United States does not and will not consider itself bound by the declaration in the Final Document of that Conference.

The Chairman: We have thus concluded consideration of draft resolutions under thematic cluster 8.

We shall now begin consideration of cluster 10, “International security”, and take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.11, the one draft resolution remaining in this cluster. Does any delegation wish to make general remarks on this cluster, or to explain their vote before we take action?

If not, we shall proceed to take action on draft resolution L.11. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.11, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Malaysia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the Committee’s 15th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.11 and A/C.1/59/INF/2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania,

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

Against:

Albania, Israel, Latvia, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Poland, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.11 was adopted by 109 votes to 9, with 49 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): As that was the only draft resolution under consideration in cluster 10, I now give the floor to delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. Sanders (Netherlands): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.11, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”. The candidate countries Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey and Croatia, the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Serbia and Montenegro, and the European Free Trade Association countries, Iceland and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, align themselves with this explanation of vote.

As stated in the EU Strategy against the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, adopted by the European Council last year, the EU is committed to the multilateral treaty system, which provides the legal and normative basis for all non-proliferation efforts. It is the EU’s conviction that a multilateral approach to security, including disarmament and non-

proliferation, provides the best way to maintain international order; hence our commitment to uphold, implement and strengthen multilateral disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements.

The EU policy is to pursue the implementation and universalization of the existing disarmament and non-proliferation norms. Unfortunately, draft resolution L.11 contains a number of elements — in both its preambular and operative paragraphs — that the European Union cannot support. As was the case last year, the elements in question are of a serious nature.

These elements in question are of a serious nature, and we again brought to the attention of the sponsors our concerns and views on this subject. We provided suggestions as to how the draft could be improved. We must conclude that our fundamental concerns have not been taken into account and that the draft resolution retains language that makes it unbalanced.

The European Union believes that unilateral, bilateral and multilateral actions in disarmament and non-proliferation can bring and have brought positive results. Among other documents, the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference itself recognizes this. Draft resolution L.11 does not give sufficient credit to such measures.

It is for these reasons that we are not in a position to support this resolution. We remain committed to multilateral approaches in the areas of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation, and we continue to recognize their importance.

Ms. Pollack (Canada): I take the floor on behalf of Australia, Canada and New Zealand to explain our abstention on L.11. We need and welcome opportunities here to promote multilateralism and non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament. However, despite our firm, longstanding commitment to multilateral principles and approaches, we are disappointed that once again we could not support this resolution.

Multilateralism is indeed a core principle in our work. It is not, however, the core principle, in the language of operative paragraph 1, which implies that it is the only fundamental means. Our shared security system is rather the sum of many parts, involving a

variety of multilateral, plurilateral, regional, bilateral and unilateral measures. All these are necessary in effective global non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament. None alone is sufficient.

We also had problems with the tone of parts of this resolution. Rather than advancing an inclusive vision of multilateralism, in our view it continues to offer a restrictive, and not universal, interpretation. Such an approach risks harming the cause of those who believe in and support its value. That is why we were unable to support L.11 and instead abstained.

We look forward to working constructively next year to enhance the role and contribution of multilateralism and to develop a resolution that can be adopted without a vote.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Does any other delegation wish to explain its vote? If not, we will conclude our consideration of cluster 10 for today.

Tomorrow the Committee will continue with adoption of resolutions and decisions, as scheduled. We also have a graduation ceremony for the scholarship holders in disarmament.

I would like to point out, however, that we do not have a very busy agenda. There are only a few resolutions for consideration tomorrow, and even fewer for Friday. Therefore, unless circumstances change, the Chair will be forced to cancel the Friday meeting, as I do not think it is appropriate to call a meeting to consider the very small number of draft resolutions that we currently have for Friday.

I invite all delegations, especially those who are co-sponsoring draft resolutions, to do what they can to further the consideration of their drafts. Without that, tomorrow we might have to decide to cancel the Friday meeting, and whatever resolutions are pending then will be dealt with next week. I would also remind delegations that informal discussions are proceeding on a number of subjects at present. If the Friday meeting is cancelled my plan is to make full use of the time — although we would not necessarily have to have conference services — so it would not be a free Friday; it would be a Friday for consultations.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.