



General Assembly

Sixty-second session

First Committee

24th meeting

Thursday, 1 November 2007, 3 p.m.

New York

Official Records

Chairperson: Mr. Badji (Senegal)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda items 88 to 105 (continued)

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

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): This afternoon, the First Committee will consider draft resolutions included in revision 1 of informal working paper No. 3 starting with cluster 1, entitled "Nuclear weapons". The Committee will then proceed to other clusters.

Before the Committee takes action on the draft resolutions, I would call attention to document A/C.1/62/CRP.5, which has just been distributed and which contains the draft programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2008. As members know, tomorrow, once we have concluded taking action on draft resolutions and decisions, we will proceed to the consideration of agenda item 121, "Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly". I would like to make a few brief comments on the draft programme of work and timetable contained in A/C.1/62/CRP.5, which has already been discussed by the Bureau.

The draft programme was established after consultations with the Chairman of the Fourth Committee. It was agreed that both the First and Fourth Committees would begin their work the first week, as they have always done, and that they would not hold their meetings at the same time. However, the Fourth Committee has agreed to allow the First Committee to

use both morning and afternoon meetings on the Tuesday of the week beginning 20 October 2008.

The total number of meetings and the allocation of meetings to the three segments of the session remain the same as during this session. Next year, we will be able to meet over a longer period: four weeks and two days. Thus, we foresee having both morning and afternoon meetings on only one day during the session. For that reason, I propose to extend the deadline for submission of all draft resolutions and decisions to the Friday of the second week. This should facilitate the work of delegations in preparing and consulting on their drafts.

It is my intention to present document A/C.1/62/CRP.5 for adoption by the Committee at its meeting tomorrow afternoon. The draft programme will, of course, be finalized and issued in its final form before the Committee starts its substantive work at the sixty-third session of the General Assembly, in 2008.

Mr. Rowe (Sierra Leone): I was wondering whether I should bring this up tomorrow when we discuss the timetable. Last week, my delegation proposed, albeit informally, the possibility of having a joint debate with the Third Committee and, probably, the Second Committee. Could that suggestion be accommodated within part (a), (b) or (c) of the thematic discussion programmed in document A/C.1/62/CRP.5? Would we have to express that explicitly in the programme of work or can we just leave it and take care of it next year?

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.

07-57564 (E)



The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): Thank you for that very relevant question, which has indeed been raised. I think that it would be preferable to be flexible and perhaps to leave our options open on this idea, instead of discussing it formally, which could involve us in rather difficult discussions. That is the view of the Chair, and I hope that delegations agree.

The Committee will resume its consideration of that document tomorrow in order possibly to have an exchange of views and perhaps be able to adopt it.

Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions remaining to be considered under cluster 1 and included in revision 1 of informal working paper no. 3, I shall give the floor to the delegation wishing to make a general statement other than an explanation of vote.

Mrs. Asmady (Indonesia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1, which are the States parties to the Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone, otherwise known as the Bangkok Treaty. Those countries are Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Viet Nam and my own country, Indonesia.

The Bangkok Treaty, which came into force on 28 March 1997, has the following objectives: to contribute effectively to regional efforts in nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation; to reassert the right of countries in the region to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and to ensure the protection of the region from environmental pollution and the hazards posed by radioactive or nuclear materials or waste; and to seek negative security assurances from nuclear-weapon States.

As a part of the creation of an Association of Southeast Asian Nations Security Community, the Bangkok Treaty directly contributes to strengthening regional peace and security. In order to achieve the objectives of the Treaty, early accession by nuclear-weapon States and cooperation among nuclear-weapon-free zones are essential.

Among the purposes of introducing this draft resolution for the first time in the General Assembly this year is to seek universal support for the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty, as 2007 marks the tenth anniversary of the Treaty's entry into force,

and to encourage States parties to the Bangkok Treaty to resume consultations with nuclear-weapon States with a view to early accession by those States. That is in line with the joint statement made by nuclear-weapon States at the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in which, among other things, they welcomed the creation of the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone and looked forward to the successful and early conclusion of the consultations with the States parties to the Bangkok Treaty, thereby paving the way for their adherence to the protocol of accession. That is also in accordance with Security Council resolution 984 (1995), which clearly recognized the legitimate interest of non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in receiving assurances from nuclear-weapon States that nuclear weapons would not be used.

In that spirit, we are grateful for the constructive engagement by some nuclear-weapon States in the process leading to the submission of this draft resolution. We are hopeful that draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1 will gain the widest possible support from member States, as a concrete sign of their commitment to promoting the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and maintaining regional and international peace and security.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 1. I shall first give the floor to representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)", which has been introduced in the First Committee for the first time.

Cuba welcomes the introduction of this draft resolution, as well as the commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the entry into force of the Bangkok Treaty. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones through the Bangkok, Tlatelolco, Rarotonga and Pelindaba Treaties and the signing of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia are important measures and positive steps towards

strengthening nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects.

The Cuban delegation reiterates that, as regards nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is crucial that nuclear-weapon States provide all the States of those regions unconditional guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Cuba reiterates that nuclear disarmament must continue to have the utmost priority in the field of disarmament. In that regard, we also acknowledge the positive impact of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

For those reasons, the Cuban delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1.

Mr. Prasad (India): I am taking the floor to explain India's vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.29, entitled "Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems", which calls for practical measures for reducing nuclear danger pending the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Two days ago, the First Committee adopted another draft resolution (A/C.1/62/L.21) on the same subject, which was supported by non-aligned countries based on the conviction that the hair-trigger posture of nuclear forces carries the unacceptable risk of the unintentional or accidental use of nuclear weapons. That draft resolution reflected the firm belief of a large number of Member States that a process of delegitimization of nuclear weapons would facilitate their eventual elimination. The operative part of the draft resolution calls for a review of nuclear doctrines and for immediate steps to reduce the risk of the unintentional or accidental use of nuclear weapons, including through the de-alerting and de-targeting of nuclear weapons. It also requests nuclear-weapon States to take measures to implement the suggested steps.

As the two draft resolutions have similar objectives and share a high degree of congruence in their operational suggestions, and as a few of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29 did not vote in favour of the draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.21, on reducing nuclear danger, we would like to appeal to them to reconsider their position in the future.

India will of course vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): There are no further speakers wishing to explain their votes before the voting. The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia at the 11th meeting, on 18 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.1, Add.4 and Add.5. In addition, Egypt and Mongolia have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, 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, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa,

San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1 was adopted by 161 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29, entitled "Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems", was introduced by the representative of New Zealand at the 11th meeting, on 18 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.29 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.1 through Add.5. In addition, Timor-Leste has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya,

Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29 was adopted by 124 votes to 3, with 34 abstentions.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): I shall now give the floor to speakers wishing to explain their votes on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29, entitled "Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems". We did so because the draft resolution is an initiative in the right direction and because we have a genuine interest in trying to reduce the unacceptable threat posed by the very existence of nuclear weapons. As we have done in the past, Cuba will continue to support any initiative that can contribute in any way to achieving the priority objective of disarmament: nuclear disarmament.

We also believe that the draft resolution has clear limitations. For Cuba, decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons is an interim measure in the nuclear disarmament process that must be urgently implemented by nuclear-weapon States. Although we acknowledge the value of reducing the deployment and operational readiness of nuclear weapons, we stress that those measures cannot take the place of irreversible reductions in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons.

Unfortunately, that belief, which is shared by the vast majority of Member States, is not clearly reflected in the draft resolution — despite the fact that Cuba provided the sponsors with timely, concrete proposals on language in that connection. Nevertheless, in order to facilitate the adoption of this new initiative, my delegation has decided to respond positively to the request of the sponsors and on this occasion not to insist on our proposals — with whose thrust the sponsors assured us that they agreed.

We understand perfectly the difficulties that most new draft resolutions encounter in the first year of their introduction at the First Committee, especially when they pertain to nuclear weapons. Clearly, our vote in favour of this draft resolution should in no way be interpreted as abandonment of our interest in strengthening the draft resolution. We shall continue to work towards that goal in the future.

Ms. Rocca (United States of America): I take the floor in explanation of vote on the two preceding draft resolutions.

The United States voted “no” on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1, entitled “Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)”. As we understand it, one of the main objectives of the draft resolution is to encourage consultations between the nuclear-weapon States and the States parties to the Bangkok Treaty to resolve outstanding issues on a number of the provisions of the Treaty and its Protocol. Such consultations have already taken place, and our Government remains willing to resume discussion of these issues with the States parties at any time. This matter affects the States parties and the nuclear-weapon States, and it might be possible to resolve it if the parties to the Treaty chose to resume consultations. The involvement of the general membership of the United Nations via this

draft resolution in order to renew those discussions is neither needed nor desirable.

The United States voted against draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29, entitled “Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems”, because we disagree in principle with its assertion, in the fourth preambular paragraph, that the current level of readiness of our nuclear-weapon systems “increases the risk of the use of such weapons, including the unintentional or accidental use”. The United States does not rely on launch-on-warning. Since the end of the cold war, the nuclear force posture of the United States has evolved away from rapid-action high alert levels. Few of the operationally deployed United States nuclear forces are maintained on a ready-alert status. No United States strategic bombers are kept on alert, and only a small number of United States nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines at sea are on alert at any given time. There are also multiple rigorous procedural and technical safeguards for intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines, to guard against accidental and unauthorized launches.

Managing alert levels commensurate with the prevailing security environment is fundamental to deterrence strategy. As long as nuclear weapons exist and are part of the United States deterrent, it is necessary for us to keep some portion of our forces at some level of alert. The United States has an obligation to manage its military forces to ensure that we remain able to protect our security and fulfil our commitments to our allies.

While we recognize that the sponsors of this draft resolution have made important changes to the original draft to recognize some basic facts, we cannot vote in favour of a draft resolution that is based on an erroneous premise.

Mr. Duncan (United Kingdom): I wish to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29, entitled “Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems”.

After due reflection, the United Kingdom has chosen to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29, because we do not subscribe to its basic premise, namely, that the world is at risk because large numbers of nuclear weapons are at dangerously high levels of alert.

The United Kingdom is grateful for the efforts of the drafters to recognize the steps taken by nuclear-weapon States, including the United Kingdom, to reduce the alert status of our nuclear forces. In fact, we believe that those steps have been sufficiently successful, such that the issue of de-alerting is not a useful priority for nuclear disarmament. The United Kingdom's nuclear weapons are not on high alert, nor are they on "launch-on-warning" status.

As reaffirmed by former Foreign Secretary Margaret Beckett in her speech to the Carnegie International Non-Proliferation Conference in June this year, the United Kingdom does believe, however, that there remain unnecessarily large numbers of nuclear weapons in the world. We are also concerned that a treaty prohibiting the production of weapons-usable fissile material — a fissile material cut-off treaty — has yet to be negotiated, and that cross-regional efforts in the Conference on Disarmament have been blocked. As I made clear in my earlier interventions, the United Kingdom shares the concern of many others in this room, and is extremely worried about the threat of yet further nuclear proliferation.

If we wish to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world, we should exert our collective effort on those major challenges.

Mr. Khalilullah (Pakistan): I have asked for the floor to explain our votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1 and A/C.1/62/L.29.

I shall begin with the draft resolution entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)", which is contained in document A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1. We voted in favour of that draft resolution. Pakistan supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. Pakistan itself has sought to promote that objective in the region for 24 years. We also support negative security assurances. However, the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1, which the Committee has just adopted, refers to two resolutions on which we have abstained. Hence, our support for draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1 should not be construed as support for the resolutions referred to in its first preambular paragraph.

I shall now explain our vote on the draft resolution entitled "Decreasing the operational

readiness of nuclear weapons systems", which is contained in document A/C.1/62/L.29. Pakistan voted in favour of that draft resolution. We agree with most of the elements referred to in the draft resolution, especially those in the fifth preambular paragraph. Moreover, we wish to underline that the notion of decreasing the operational status of nuclear weapons must be based on reciprocity.

The draft resolution notes only one bilateral initiative. Pakistan, too, has proposed the establishment of a strategic restraint regime in South Asia, which, *inter alia*, encompasses the rationale and objective of this draft resolution. We hope that the sponsors of the draft resolution will also recognize and support the proposal for a strategic restraint regime in South Asia.

Mr. Maclachlan (Australia): I am taking the floor to give an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29.

Australia supports further reductions in the operational status of nuclear weapons. Moves in that direction need to be made in ways that promote international stability and security. We are mindful that there is no consensus on this draft resolution among the nuclear-weapon States. Those considerations led us to abstain on this occasion.

Mr. Itzhaki (Israel): I would like to give an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1.

The international community has recognized that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones should emanate from within the region concerned. It can only be based on arrangements freely arrived at through direct negotiations among the States of the region and those others directly concerned. Such a zone cannot be imposed from the outside; nor can it emerge before the conditions for it have ripened.

In view of the lack of consensus on this draft resolution, Israel has chosen to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation takes the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)".

India voted in favour of that draft resolution, which was sponsored by the Association of Southeast

Asian Nations. India's position has been that, given the global dimension of nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapon-free zones can only be considered an interim measure pending the achievement of the goal of universal, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament, on which negotiations are long overdue.

Within that overall conceptual framework, India respects the sovereign choice of non-nuclear-weapon States to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and taking into account the specific characteristics and security considerations and the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2).

We commend the commitment of Asian countries, with which we have significant and growing interaction, to maintaining the region as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. As a responsible nuclear-weapon State, India has conveyed an unambiguous assurance that it will respect the status of the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone.

Mr. Grinius (Canada): I take the floor today to explain Canada's abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29.

Reducing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems remains important for Canada. Our vote in favour and sponsorship of Japan's draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30, which specifically calls upon nuclear-weapon States to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons systems, confirms that position.

In terms of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29, Canada is pleased that there is explicit reference to the significant steps already taken by a number of nuclear-weapon States to reduce alert times and de-target their weapons. Both the measures taken by these nuclear-weapon States to reduce the operational status of their weapons, and the recognition by the international community of those important steps are important.

However, at the same time, there must also be recognition that, for the time being, deterrence remains an important element of international security and a fundamental component of defence strategy of the NATO, of which Canada is a member. Canada's nuclear arms control and disarmament policy balances our disarmament objectives with our security

obligations and reflects the commitments made by States parties at the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

While we encourage measures to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons systems, those steps must be taken in a way that promotes international stability and must be based on the principle of undiminished security for all.

Despite our abstention today, Canada welcomes the level of debate generated by this draft resolution, not only among delegations but also with civil society. We hope that active discussion on this issue will continue.

Mr. Dobelle (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to make a statement on behalf of France and the United Kingdom on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1 and, in my national capacity, on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29.

First of all, my delegation is speaking on behalf of the United Kingdom and France to explain our votes on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)", on which both of our delegations abstained. Our countries believe that a regional approach to disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation remains crucial. This is a realistic approach, consisting of seeking a political solution to regional tensions and latent or open conflicts in order to promote progress on security and thus on disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation.

This is why we have supported the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and have provided security assurances to more than 100 States through treaties. The United Kingdom and France are parties to the relevant protocols of the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga and Pelindaba. We recall in this connection that the security assurances afforded by our two countries in no way constitute renunciation of the right to self-defence, in conformity with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

Regarding nuclear-weapon-free zones, the United Kingdom and France have stated many times, including very recently at the meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the 2010 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, that we are ready to pursue this path and that we are awaiting the proposals of the States of the South-East Asia Nuclear-

Weapon-Free Zone to resume negotiations on a protocol to the Bangkok Treaty.

In this connection, we consider that the submission by the countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1 expresses their wish to resume the dialogue that was suspended in 2005 in the framework of which we have, jointly with the other nuclear-weapon States, made proposals to which no reply has been given. We hope for the resumption of constructive dialogue; we are encouraged by the quality of exchanges that we have had here in New York in recent weeks.

I would like now, in my national capacity, to address draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29, entitled "Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems". France is not against the notion of decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems, the strategic situation permitting and the conditions of our overall security being maintained. In this regard, France announced reductions of the operational readiness of its nuclear weapons systems in 1992 and 1996. In 1997, France announced that French forces had been de-targeted.

Additionally, France has implemented considerate technical means as well as strict, rigorous and effective procedures to guarantee that no weapon can be used without a legitimate order from the President of the Republic. Important measures that respond to the demands of this draft resolution have thus been already taken and provide concrete and reliable responses to the concerns of its sponsors. The text before us asks us to go further, but we cannot consider the matter in a manner unconnected to the current strategic context.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1 and A/C.1/62/L.29.

Beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.19/Rev.1, China has always respected and supported the efforts of given countries and regions to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones in accordance with their situations and on the basis of consultation and voluntary agreement. China believes that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is conducive to promoting nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and to strengthening the peace, security and stability of the region in question.

In view of this, China has signed and ratified the relevant protocols to the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga and Pelindaba treaties concerning nuclear-weapon-free zones. China is a close neighbour of the countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and has maintained traditional and friendly cooperation with ASEAN. China highly commends and supports ASEAN's efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South-East Asia. China and ASEAN have reached consensus on the protocol to the Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone. We hope that ASEAN will appropriately resolve the issue of the protocol, as soon as possible, with all other nuclear States so that the protocol can be opened for signature at an early date. As always, China will support the efforts of countries in other regions in establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29, China has always put forward the complete prevention and total destruction of nuclear weapons. China supports interim nuclear disarmament measures, and we are willing to implement relevant measures at an appropriate time and under appropriate conditions in the process of nuclear disarmament.

At the same time, China believes that any nuclear disarmament measures, including the various interim measures, should be guided by the spirit embodied in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, be aimed at maintaining global strategic stability and the undiminished security of all countries, and facilitate international peace and security. We believe that, at present, the most realistic and reasonable interim nuclear disarmament measures would be for all neighbouring States to undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time and in any circumstances and not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon-free zones, and for international legal instruments to be concluded in that respect.

To date, China is the only nuclear-weapon State that has made and abided by such a commitment. We call on other nuclear-weapon States to follow suit. In 1994, China formally submitted to other nuclear-weapon States a draft text on mutual non-first use of nuclear weapons. It has actively sought on a bilateral basis to reach arrangements on the non-first use and mutual de-targeting of nuclear weapons against each other. In 1994, China and the Russian Federation

undertook not to be the first to use or target nuclear weapons against each other. In 1998, China and the United States pledged not to target their respective nuclear weapons against each other. In 2000, the five nuclear-weapon States — China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States of America — issued a joint statement in which they pledged not to target their respective nuclear weapons against any country in the world.

The Chinese delegation fully understands the good intentions of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.29. We note, however, that different views exist regarding the effectiveness of decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems. China therefore found it difficult to support the draft resolution.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): May I take it that the Committee has concluded its consideration of draft resolutions in cluster 1?

It was so decided.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): I now invite the Committee to turn to draft resolutions in cluster 4.

I give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Maclachlan (Australia): Australia takes the floor on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38/Rev.1 on the prevention of the illicit transfer and unauthorized access to and use of man-portable air defence systems (MANPADS), of which there are approximately 60 sponsors, although I shall spare delegations by not reading out the full list.

Australia sought a deferral of action on the draft resolution when we learned from the Secretariat that a vote would be called on it, although it has traditionally been adopted by consensus. The draft resolution has traditionally welcomed international and regional efforts to strengthen transport security against the risk of MANPADS attack. This year, the tenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution welcomes work undertaken on airport vulnerability assessments. Those assessments are technical studies of an airport's perimeter to assess vulnerability to MANPADS attack on arriving or departing aircraft. Taking into account aircraft landing and take-off patterns, the assessments focus on potential launch sites, such as parks, cemeteries and vacant allotments. Such assessments are directly relevant to protecting civil aviation from MANPADS attacks by non-State actors.

Airport vulnerability assessments are firmly in the interests of all States represented in this room, for we all rely on some form of civil air transport and, in some cases, our States have national and other airlines that visit airports across the globe. We all benefit from airport vulnerability assessments, even when undertaken in other States.

We understand, however, that reference to airport vulnerability assessments will not gain consensus. With respect, we are not convinced by the reasoning given for the deletion of the phrase "including through airport vulnerability assessments" from the tenth preambular paragraph. However, in an effort to maintain consensus on the draft resolution, we and the other sponsors propose to introduce an oral revision to the tenth preambular paragraph, namely, the deletion of the phrase "including through airport vulnerability assessments". We trust that, with that change, the draft resolution will now be adopted by consensus.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38/Rev.1, as orally revised.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38/Rev.1, entitled "Prevention of the illicit transfer and unauthorized access to and use of man-portable air defence systems", was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 21st meeting on 30 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.38/Rev.1, A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and its addenda 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

As we have heard, the representative of Australia has just introduced an oral revision to the tenth preambular paragraph, by which the words "including through airport vulnerability assessments" would be deleted. The revised paragraph would read:

"Welcoming the ongoing efforts of, and noting declarations by, various international and regional forums to enhance transport security and to strengthen management of man-portable air defence systems stockpiles in order to prevent the illicit transfer and unauthorized access to and use of such weapons."

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.49/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.49/Rev.1, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”, was introduced by the representative of Colombia at the 21st meeting, on 30 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.49/Rev.1 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.1 to Add.5. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors: Austria, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Ireland, Kyrgyzstan, Luxembourg, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia and Sweden.

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, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, 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, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco,

Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, 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:

United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.49/Rev.1 was adopted by 165 votes to 1.

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

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Ms. Rocca (United States of America): The United States remains fully committed to the implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. We have upheld our obligations under that agreement and encourage others to do the same. Throughout this process, we have expressed our firm position that, in order for the Programme of Action to be successful, States must undertake practical measures for implementation, including the destruction of surplus weapons, the development and enforcement of arms export and import control policies, and better stockpiling management. Such meaningful steps do not require additional meetings, and while the United States remains ready and able to assist other States in fulfilling their obligations under the Programme of Action, we remain consistent in the view, first expressed in 2001, that a perpetual series of meetings

is not required to achieve that. Nor do we believe that such meetings are likely to advance the real objectives of this draft resolution. Therefore, we voted against draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.49/Rev.1.

Ms. Alowais (United Arab Emirates) (*spoke in Arabic*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, the Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and the United Arab Emirates. We decided to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38/Add.1 after it had been orally revised. We hope that, during the sixty-third session of the General Assembly, the Australian delegation will begin serious consultations to address the concerns of all States with respect to the draft resolution on this topic and to reach consensus in that regard.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38/Rev.1, as orally revised, which has just been adopted.

Since the Islamic Republic of Iran agrees with the main thrust of the draft resolution, namely, to prevent unauthorized access to man-portable air defence systems (MANPADs), my delegation joined the consensus. However, one should not lose sight of the fact that MANPADs are designed primarily as a defensive tool against aerial offensive attacks. Given the recent sharp increase in the number of threats — including aerial threats — against countries, the importance of that defensive tool has been increased.

We are pleased that, with the constructive cooperation of the sponsors, the relevant provisions of the draft resolution concerning the legitimate right of States to manufacture, import, export, transfer and possess man-portable air defence systems for their self-defence and security needs have been improved.

The other important element is full implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action, which has been emphasized in operative paragraph 1. In that regard, we attach great importance to the principles included in the preambular part of the Programme of Action and believe that, in any discussion or arrangement on the issue of MANPADs, those principles should be duly taken into account.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela is committed to the fight against the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. That is why we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.49/Rev.1, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

However, I wish to stress that the primary responsibility for undertaking measures to combat such illicit activity rests with the State and its relevant institutions. In that connection, it is the authorities of the States where manufacturers of such weapons operate who have primary responsibility for taking appropriate measures to ensure that such weapons, including ammunition, are duly marked before their export or transfer, so as to prevent their diversion to groups or individuals acting outside the law.

Venezuela also believes that international cooperation based on respect for the norms and principles of international law is an important element in the fight against the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. International cooperation initiatives are essential to supplement national efforts, but such cooperation must be provided without conditions and must respect the sovereign right of States to determine their own priorities and needs.

Mr. De Alba (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Mexico wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.49/Rev.1.

Two days ago, during the thematic debate on conventional weapons, my delegation expressed its recognition of the efforts of the sponsors of the draft resolution we have just adopted to reflect and accommodate the very diverse concerns of interested States. Those efforts were led most professionally and constructively by the delegation of Colombia, and enabled us to sponsor the original draft in document A/C.1/62/L.49. However, as we have just noted, in the quest for consensus important elements of the draft resolution were deleted from A/C.1/62/L.49, compelling the delegation of Mexico to withdraw its sponsorship. We deeply regret the situation.

Mexico supports the search for consensus, in particular on such urgent and priority issues as that before us, but we also reject its manipulation to impose personal perspectives or, worse still, to prevent the clear majority will from being translated into concrete results. We have never supported the right of veto that

certain parties are demanding in the Security Council; much less do we accept consensus being used in an equivalent manner in this Committee. Consensus is nothing but a working method to achieve harmonious progress on our agenda when circumstances permit, but we cannot accept a descent to the lowest common denominator whereby the substance of the issue is sacrificed merely to perpetuate the procedure. The value of the 2001 Programme of Action is based not on our capacity to preserve a six-year old consensus, but on our ability to develop and strengthen it.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote on draft resolutions in cluster 4. We have thus concluded taking action on draft resolutions in cluster 4, "Conventional weapons". We shall now take action on draft resolutions in cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

I give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements other than explanations of vote.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like at the outset to say that the delegation of Cuba fully endorses the statement that will soon be made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM).

With respect to cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security", the 118 countries of the Non-Aligned Movement have submitted a new draft resolution this year, contained in document A/C.1/62/L.18/Rev.1 and entitled "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium". The draft resolution deals with a very important subject that is of legitimate concern to the international community and that must not continue to be ignored by the First Committee.

Internationally, many countries and organizations have voiced their concerns about the effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium. Bodies such as the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and the European Parliament, to mention only two examples, have adopted many resolutions which very clearly reflect these concerns.

Preliminary studies conducted by international bodies such as the United Nations Environmental Programme, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the World Health Organization have concluded that

it is necessary to continue research to determine the long-term health and environmental effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium.

We regret that one group of countries will not support this draft resolution submitted by the Non-Aligned Movement. Among those that will not be voting in favour of the draft resolution, we find many countries that have acknowledged that they have no difficulty with the text but that nonetheless believe that they have to show solidarity and political commitment to others. But the most important point is that draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.18/Rev.1 will get firm support from the great majority of Member States. Its adoption will be an important first step towards what we conceive as the beginning of a progressive process that will make it possible to begin to properly address this question within the United Nations.

Under cluster 6, the Non-Aligned Movement has also presented four other draft resolutions and a draft decision: draft resolutions A/C.1/62/L.13, "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation"; A/C.1/62/L.14, "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control"; A/C.1/62/L.16, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace"; and A/C.1/62/L.50, "Relationship between disarmament and development"; and draft decision A/C.1/62/L.51, "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security".

These texts tackle diverse and important questions which are highly relevant not only to the NAM countries, but to the entire international community. Thus, Cuba urges all delegations to support these draft texts submitted by the Non-Aligned Movement under cluster 6. We hope that they will be adopted by overwhelming majorities, as has been the case with similar texts in years past.

Mr. Ruddyard (Indonesia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). Under cluster 6, the Movement has submitted six draft resolutions and one draft decision, as I will now describe.

First, I will discuss the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.16 entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of

Peace”. Since the adoption of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace in 1971, the situation in the world, particularly in the Indian Ocean, has undergone major changes. Today, in that region a number of initiatives have been taken to bring about the socio-economic development of the countries concerned on the basis of economic, technical and scientific cooperation. In this context, there is still ample room to develop measures to realize the objectives of the 1971 Declaration.

The second is the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.14, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”. NAM considers that the continued sustainability of the global environment is an issue of utmost importance, especially for coming generations. We should collectively endeavour to ensure that necessary measures are taken to preserve and protect the environment, especially in the formulation and implementation of agreements concerning disarmament and arms control. We call upon all Member States to ensure the application of scientific and technological processes in the framework of international security, disarmament and other related fields, without detriment to the environment or to its effective contribution to attaining sustainable development.

Thirdly, draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.13 is entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”. NAM believes strongly in multilateralism and multilaterally agreed solutions, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, as the only sustainable way of addressing disarmament and international security issues. NAM also believes that it is critical for the General Assembly to adopt such a draft resolution in order to reflect our continued conviction of the role of the United Nations in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. NAM underscores multilateralism as the core principle in negotiations in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation with a view to maintaining and strengthening universal norms and enlarging their scope.

Fourthly, with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.50 on the relationship between disarmament and development, NAM believes that the symbiotic relationship between disarmament and development and the important role of security in that connection cannot be denied. We are concerned by

increasing global military expenditures, which could otherwise go into development, poverty eradication and the elimination of diseases, particularly in the developing countries. NAM reiterates the importance of exercising restraint in military expenditure so that the human and financial resources thus saved can be used for the ongoing efforts to eradicate poverty and achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

In that connection, NAM welcomes the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on the relationship between disarmament and development and its reappraisal of that significant issue in the current international context. We consider it important to follow up on the implementation of the Action Programme adopted at the 1987 International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. In that regard, we invite Member States to provide the Secretary-General with information regarding measures and efforts to devote part of the resources made available by the implementation of disarmament and arms limitation agreements to economic and social development, with a view to reducing the ever-widening gap between developed and developing countries.

Fifthly, a new draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.18/Rev.1 is entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”. Depleted uranium is a chemically toxic and radioactive compound that is used in armour-piercing munitions because of its very high density. There is not yet a clear understanding of the full impact that fine particles of depleted uranium may have on the human body. The International Atomic Energy Agency, the World Health Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme have all stated that more research is needed with respect to the immediate and/or long-term health or environmental effects of depleted uranium munitions. In that connection, the draft resolution reflects a legitimate concern of the international community over the possible impacts of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium. It excludes controversial issues that were introduced in a previous resolution on that issue to the First Committee.

Last is a draft decision A/C.1/62/L.51 entitled “Review of the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security”. NAM reaffirms the importance of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security adopted by the

General Assembly on 16 December 1970, which, among other things, emphasizes the need for the United Nations to exert continuous efforts in the strengthening of international peace and security.

In closing, the Non-Aligned Movement hopes that all delegations will be able to join us in supporting the six draft resolutions and the draft decision and that action will be taken shortly.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): I now call on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Pereira Gomes (Portugal): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.45, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; and the European Free Trade Association country Norway, member of the European Economic Area; as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia align themselves with this declaration.

The European Union (EU) will vote in favour of this draft resolution. At the same time, we would like to make some comments on the implications of the relationship between security and telecommunications technologies. That relationship has to be seen in a broader understanding of security in an ever-evolving world of new technologies.

The EU supports the idea in the draft resolution that the dissemination and use of information technologies and means affects the interests of the entire international community and that optimum effectiveness is enhanced by broad international cooperation. The EU is also concerned that those technologies and means can potentially be used for purposes that are inconsistent with the objectives of maintaining international stability and security, and may adversely affect the integrity of the infrastructure of States to the detriment of their security in both the civil and military fields.

The threat to cyber-security can equally originate from coordinated attacks by organized criminals, individual hackers motivated, for example, by political

propaganda, and non-State actors, including terrorists. It is clear that, in today’s world, where individuals, Governments and societies rely more on information technology to provide or receive information or services, that kind of attack can severely affect the functioning of a State.

One of the effective ways to fight the criminal or illegal use of information technologies is for States to criminalize the misuse of information technology and to implement measures designed to prevent damage to critical information infrastructures, regardless of the source of the threat. In that regard, the European Union would like to draw attention to the Convention on Cybercrime of the Council of Europe. The Convention is open to accession by non-members of the Council of Europe, and we call upon all States to accede to it.

The EU also invites the group of governmental experts to be established in 2009 to study instances in which critical national information infrastructures have been under attack, and to consider recommendations on how to investigate and criminalize such acts, including facilitating tracing attacks on critical information infrastructures and, when appropriate, the disclosure of tracing information to other countries.

Mr. Limeres (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Republic of Argentina supports the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.18/Rev.1, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”.

At the same time, I wish to point out that any restriction of the use of a specific system of armaments affecting health or the environment must be based on solid scientific knowledge. My country notes that the draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to submit a report on the basis of the views of Member States and relevant international organizations on the effects of the use of armaments. In that respect, once the report has been submitted to the General Assembly, a group of governmental experts should consider the subject comprehensively.

Ms. Rocca (United States of America): Our delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.18/Rev.1, “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”.

The draft resolution calls for actions by the Secretary-General and United Nations Member States based on the potential harmful effects of the use of

depleted uranium munitions on human health and the environment. By doing so, it ignores a significant body of scientific evidence on that subject. The environmental and long-term health effects of the use of depleted uranium munitions have been investigated by the United States Department of Defense, NATO, the United Nations Environment Programme, the World Health Organization, the European Commission and others. None of those inquiries has been able to document environmental or health effects attributable to the use of those munitions.

This is not a new issue. The same questionable assertions have been made before in draft resolutions that have come before this Committee. United Nations Member States in the past have widely chosen to defeat a draft resolution such as this, and they should do so again.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to the vote on draft resolutions under cluster 6.

The Committee will first vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.13. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.13, entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the 16th meeting on 24 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/62/L.13.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq,

Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.13 was adopted by 112 votes to 4, with 51 abstentions.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.14. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.14, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", was introduced by the representative of

Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the 16th meeting on 24 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/62/L.14.

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, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.14 was adopted by 162 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.16. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.16, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the 16th meeting on 24 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/62/L.16.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore,

Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.16 was adopted by 120 votes to 3, with 45 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Ukraine advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.18/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.18/Rev.1, entitled "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the 16th meeting on 24 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/62/L.18/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh,

Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.18/Rev.1 was adopted by 122 votes to 6, with 35 abstentions.

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

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.45. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.45, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”, was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 16th meeting on 24 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.45 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and its addenda 2 and 3.

With the permission of the Chairman, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.45.

“Under the terms of operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.45, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts, to be established in 2009 on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, to continue to study existing and potential threats in the sphere of information security and possible cooperative measures to address them, as well as the concepts referred to in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, and to submit a report on the results of this study to the General Assembly at its sixty-fifth session.

“Pursuant to the request contained in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the group of governmental experts would hold one organizational session in Geneva in 2009 and three substantive sessions in New York in 2010. The conference servicing requirements for the organizational session of the group of governmental experts in 2009 has been estimated at \$130,000 at current rates, and those for the three substantive sessions in 2010 are estimated to be \$742,800 at current rates.

“In addition, non-conference servicing requirements have been estimated at \$120,000 at current rates for 2009 and \$508,700 at current rates for 2010, which include travel of experts and costs of consultants for the substantive servicing of the organizational session and the three substantive sessions of the proposed group of governmental experts.

“Provisions for the requirements pertaining to the organizational session of the group of governmental experts in 2009 have been included under Section 2, ‘General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management’; Section 4, ‘Disarmament’; Section 28D, ‘Office of Central Support Services’; and Section 28E, ‘Administration, Geneva’ of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. The conference servicing and non-conference servicing requirements for the three substantive sessions of the group of governmental experts in 2010 would be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

“Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.45 and establish the aforementioned group of governmental experts in 2009, no programme budget implications would arise in the biennium 2008-2009.”

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, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova,

Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, 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:

United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.45 was adopted by 168 votes to 1.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.50. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.50, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the 16th meeting, on 24 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/62/L.50.

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, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba,

Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, 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:

United States of America

Abstaining:

France, Israel

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.50 was adopted by 166 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft decision A/C.1/62/L.51. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/62/L.51, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the

Strengthening of International Security”, was introduced by Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the 16th meeting, on 24 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/62/L.51.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The sponsors have expressed the wish that the draft decision be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/62/L.51 was adopted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The floor is open to delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft texts just adopted.

Mr. Dobelle (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.50, “Relationship between disarmament and development”. For several years now, the international community has noted the links that exist between the questions of disarmament and development. My delegation does not challenge those links. We fully adhere to it in the sense that the creation of a stable and secure environment through disarmament in post-conflict areas is one of the preconditions for the success of any reconstruction and development policy.

Nor do we call into question the challenge of financing development. Major French initiatives on innovative sources of financing bear witness to the importance we attach to this subject. That said, my delegation has continued to abstain in the voting on this draft resolution due to some aspects of the text which we are unable to endorse; each year we make these known to the sponsors of the draft resolutions on this item, but our comments are not taken into account.

In the preambular part, we find it excessive to describe the relationship between disarmament and development as “symbiotic” (*seventh preambular paragraph*). While it is clear that disarmament has an impact on development conditions, it is only one factor promoting peace and security, which are conditions necessary for development. More important for France, we question the notion that the implementation of disarmament agreements can, in the short term, immediately release resources for development assistance, as operative paragraph 3 implies.

We all know that the implementation of these agreements bear a cost. Take, for example, the destruction of conventional weapons stockpiles, to which the Organization for Economic Security and Cooperation in Europe greatly contributes. Chemical weapons disarmament too is a long and costly process, as we can see in the discussions in the framework of the Chemical Weapons Convention. This reality is not reflected in the text before us.

Finally, efforts in the area of disarmament must be general and cannot be limited to implementing agreements on this issue. The paragraph-3 invitation must be broadened to encompass all arms control and disarmament efforts, efforts which are favourable to development.

Those elements, regrettably, made it impossible for us to vote in favour of this draft resolution. Our delegation is available to work with the sponsors of this text at the next session on proposed text that which would enable us to vote in favour of the draft resolution and thus to express the importance we attach to the relationship between disarmament and development.

Ms. Rocca (United States of America): My delegation voted “no” on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.45, “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

The United States agrees that effective information-network and infrastructure security is essential to ensure reliability, availability and integrity of those national and global information networks on which States and their citizens increasingly depend for essential services and economic security. The issue to be addressed is how nations can act, individually and as a community, to enhance information-network and infrastructure security and prevent debilitating attacks.

The United States and 34 other States have already signed the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime, which provides guidelines for national legislation and cross-border law enforcement cooperation. All countries, whether party to the Convention or not, can use it immediately as a model for drafting effective domestic laws against cybercrime.

The unique attributes of information technology, however, do not lend themselves to the types of

constraints familiar to the disarmament community. The tools to attack our information networks can be devised effectively by just about anyone — not just Governments — and such tools change far more quickly than ordinary weapons. Most of these attacks are criminal in nature, and attributing actions to specific actors, let alone sponsors, is often extremely difficult.

The draft resolution repeats the call for the convening of a group of governmental experts. The recent two-year-long effort that explored ways to bridge differences on this issue found little common ground. We continue to see no reason to think anything has changed. Moreover, we believe that any attempt to negotiate a treaty instrument beyond the extant Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime would be equally fruitless.

Mr. Grinius (Canada): I take the floor on behalf of Australia, Canada and New Zealand to explain our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.13, “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”.

We were disappointed that, once again, we were unable to support the draft resolution on this subject. Our firm and unwavering commitment to multilateral principles and approaches in the field of non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament is well known, and we have consistently advocated the benefit of multilateral processes in achieving progress on international security issues.

However, we cannot agree with the implications of operative paragraphs 1 and 2 that multilateralism constitutes the core principle in negotiations and in resolving concerns in this field. Effective progress on global non-proliferation and disarmament objectives requires a mutually reinforcing system of multilateral, plurilateral, regional, bilateral and unilateral measures, working in tandem to achieve concrete results.

The eighth preambular paragraph explicitly recognizes the complementarity of these measures. So why, then, do operative paragraphs 1 and 2 suggest that multilateral ones are somehow of greater importance than the others? In our view, any assertion that multilateralism and multilaterally agreed solutions provide the only sustainable methods of addressing non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament issues sells short the potential of alternative approaches such

as bilateral and regional measures to contribute to our efforts in the field of international security.

Those are the reasons why we have been unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.13 and have instead abstained in the voting.

Mr. Duncan (United Kingdom): I should like to give the United Kingdom’s explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.50, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”.

The United Kingdom is pleased to be able to support the draft resolution. We welcome the mainstreaming of disarmament issues in development policy. That is particularly important in the field of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons, and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration.

The United Kingdom does not believe, however, that there is an automatic link between disarmament and development. Rather, a complex relationship exists between the two. Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.50 does not explain fully the complexity of that relationship. The United Kingdom tried to focus attention on that aspect last year when we said that we had some reservations about the report of the Group of Governmental Experts. We explained that the report did not give sufficient credit to unilateral, bilateral and multilateral actions in disarmament and non-proliferation.

Finally, the United Kingdom notes that, while it would be desirable to share information about resources made available for development through the implementation of disarmament and arms control agreements, in practice it is not possible to identify a direct relationship between different sources of funding. We will, however, continue to make available information on our increasing levels of development assistance through relevant forums.

Mr. Tarui (Japan): I would like to explain Japan’s vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.18/Rev.1, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”, which Japan supported in the voting.

Japan recognizes that, despite studies conducted by relevant international organizations on human health and the environmental effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium, at present no internationally definitive

conclusion has been drawn. Japan will continue to follow carefully the development of the studies conducted by relevant international organizations.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote on draft resolutions under cluster 6.

The Committee will now turn to draft resolutions under cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". I call on the representative of Indonesia, who wishes to make a general statement.

Mr. Ruddyard (Indonesia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and to make this statement before action on cluster 7.

During this year's session of the First Committee, many delegations have reaffirmed the validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. They have expressed their determination to promote multilateralism as an essential way to develop arms regulations and disarmament negotiations.

In the Final Document adopted by consensus at the conclusion of the first special session on disarmament, the thirtieth anniversary of which we will be commemorating next year, we stated, among other things, that while the final objective of the efforts of all States should continue to be general and complete disarmament under effective international control, the immediate goal is that of the elimination of the danger of nuclear weapons.

In spite of the best efforts of the international community, the existing disarmament machinery has not produced adequate or satisfying results. There is urgent need, therefore, for the revitalization of the machinery and forum appropriately constituted for disarmament deliberations and negotiations. That should begin with the strengthening of the role and responsibility of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament, in accordance with the Charter. The way towards that, we believe, is through the convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In our view, the convening of the fourth special session on disarmament is both timely and appropriate, for the following reasons.

First, it can set the future course of action and a balanced approach to reaching a new consensus in

arms control, disarmament, non-proliferation and related international security matters, including a comprehensive review of the disarmament machinery. Secondly, there is a need to address the existing and new threats to international peace and security in a comprehensive and transparent manner with the broad participation of all Member States. Thirdly, in view of those unprecedented threats and challenges, concerted multilateral efforts under the only auspices which offer the only legitimate and lasting solutions has become imperative, and the United Nations should play a more effective role. Lastly, there is general agreement among Member States on the need to revitalize the disarmament machinery, including the First Committee, the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament. They cannot afford to allow its agenda to remain deadlocked. Therefore, the disarmament agenda, as contained in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, should be revived on an urgent basis.

The draft resolution before us, contained in document A/C.1/62/L.17/Rev.1, calls for the convening of the Open-ended Working Group which was established by resolution 61/60 of 6 December 2006, and for it to hold its organizational session in order to schedule its substantive sessions in 2008 and to subsequently submit a report on its work before the end of the sixty-second session of the General Assembly.

NAM continues to underline the necessity of working towards the convening of the fourth special session on disarmament and reaffirms its strong support of that objective, taking into account the constructive dialogue and active engagement that have existed among Member States, including key delegations, during the 2007 substantive sessions of the Open-ended Working Group.

In that regard, NAM encourages all Member States to continue to work closely and constructively and to fully utilize the forthcoming substantive sessions of the Open-ended Working Group to consider the objectives and agenda of the fourth special session on disarmament, and consequently to support draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.17/Rev.1.

A second draft resolution under this cluster that NAM has submitted is A/C.1/62/L.15, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament". NAM underlines that the United Nations regional

centres for peace and disarmament have been instrumental in promoting understanding and cooperation among States in their respective regions in the fields of peace, disarmament and development. The General Assembly continues its appeal to all Member States, as well as to international governmental and non-governmental organizations, to make voluntary contributions to the centres in order to strengthen, facilitate and implement their programmes and activities.

The Non-Aligned Movement hopes that all delegations will be able to join us in supporting these draft resolutions.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): As no other delegation wishes to make a general statement or to speak in explanation of vote or position, we shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.15. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.15, entitled “United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the 18th meeting, on 26 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in A/C.1/62/L.15.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I will now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.15.

“Under the terms of operative paragraph 5 of A/C.1/62/L.15, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide all necessary support, within existing resources, to the regional centres in carrying out their programmes of activities. The implementation of the request would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, ‘Disarmament’, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. The provision therein covers the three P-5 posts of directors of these regional centres for peace and disarmament.

“The programmes of activities of these three centres would continue to be financed through extrabudgetary resources. Accordingly, if the General Assembly should adopt draft

resolution A/C.1/62/L.15, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

“The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provision of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ).

“The attention of the Committee is also drawn to paragraph 67 of the first report of the Advisory Committee on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001, which indicates that the use of the phrase ‘within existing resources’, or similar language, has a negative impact on the implementation of activities. Therefore, efforts should be made to avoid the use of this phrase in resolutions and decisions.”

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.15 have expressed the wish that the Committee 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.1/62/L.15 was adopted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.17/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): A/C.1/62/L.17/Rev.1, entitled “Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the 18th meeting, on 26 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in A/C.1/62/L.17/Rev.1.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.17/Rev.1.

“I would start by noting that by operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would:

“[Decide] to convene the Open-ended Working Group, working on the basis of consensus, to consider the objectives and the agenda, including the possible establishment of the preparatory committee, for the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament;

“Also [decide] that the Working Group hold its organizational meeting as soon as possible for the purpose of setting a date for its substantive session in 2008, and submit a report on its work, including possible substantive recommendations, before the end of the sixty-second session of the General Assembly;’ and

“[Request] the Secretary-General, within existing resources, to provide the Open-ended Working Group with the necessary assistance and services as may be required to discharge its tasks.’

“Pursuant to the aforementioned requests, it has envisioned that the Open-ended Working Group will hold 16 meetings in 2008 in New York. Based on the established practice, working groups of the General Assembly are provided with conference services on the understanding that they cannot meet concurrently with the General Assembly and that no two working groups can meet simultaneously. Accordingly, the exact dates for the 16 meetings in 2008 of the Open-ended Working Group will be determined in consultations in between the substantive Secretariat and the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, subject to the availability of conference facilities and services allocated to the General Assembly and its working groups and on the condition that no two working groups of the General Assembly would meet simultaneously.

“Should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.17/Rev.1, the estimated total full costs of conference servicing and conference facilities would amount to \$378,600, at current rates, in the biennium 2008-2009. However, since the required conference services

for the Working Group would be allocated from those already earmarked for meetings of the General Assembly, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

“The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ).

“The attention of the Committee is also drawn to paragraph 67 of the first report of the Advisory Committee on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001, which indicates that the use of the phrase ‘within existing resources’ or similar language in resolutions has a negative impact on the implementation of activities. Therefore, efforts should be made to avoid the use of that phrase in resolutions and decisions.”

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, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein,

Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, 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:

United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted by 166 votes to 1.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): As there are no requests for the floor in explanation of vote, the Commission has thus concluded its action on draft resolutions submitted under cluster 7, and on all draft resolutions listed in revision 1 of unofficial working paper no. 3.

A delegation has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. Before giving the floor to that delegation, I should like to remind the Committee of the relevant provisions of the rules of procedure, by which delegations may make two statements in exercise of the right of reply. The first statement shall be limited to 10 minutes and the second to five minutes.

I give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Maclachlan (Australia): I can assure members and you, Sir, that my statement will be considerably less than 10 minutes in length.

Australia has asked for the floor to exercise its right of reply with regard to comments made about the

consultations procedures on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38/Rev.1, which was adopted a short time ago.

For the record, Australia distributed a copy of the original draft of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38 by facsimile to all delegations on the very first day of the First Committee's work. We held the very first open informal consultations of any delegation, on the second day of the Committee's work and they included draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38. We held a second open informal consultation on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38 at the start of the second week of the Committee's work. In addition, we held countless bilateral consultations and discussions on the text of the draft resolution during the session.

Throughout that time, Australia received many proposals to amend the text. We listened to and considered carefully all of those proposals, even those we received very late in the third week of our work. Australia and our fellow sponsors did indeed take on board comments, as others have noted. We submitted a revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38 last week. That we did so is evidence of the constructive and flexible approach we have taken throughout this session of the First Committee, and in particular on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38/Rev.1.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to make some announcements.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Members have before them informal paper no. 4, which lists the remaining three draft texts on which the Committee will be taking action tomorrow. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.46/Rev.1, it will be moved to appear under cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction". A revised informal paper no. 4 will be circulated to members at the beginning of our meeting tomorrow afternoon.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.46/Rev.1, to which the Secretary has just referred, my delegation would like to know when the text will be available, given that we are to take action on it tomorrow and that we do not yet have copies of it.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): I have been informed that there was a revision to that draft resolution and that the Translation Service was not able

to produce a document by this afternoon. It will be ready by tomorrow morning, when members will have copies before them. Given that situation, I think the Committee will be requested to make an exception to the 24-hour rule on the availability of draft texts before

the voting. However, I think the members are aware of the contents of the draft resolution, as it has already been published. This is just a matter of a simple revision. Therefore, I think we can make the requested exception with regard to the 24-hour rule.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.