



# General Assembly

Sixty-third session

## First Committee

**20**<sup>th</sup> meeting

Wednesday, 29 October 2008, 3 p.m.  
New York

*Official Records*

*Chairperson:* Mr. Marco Antonio Suazo . . . . . (Honduras)

*The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.*

### Agenda items 81 to 96 (*continued*)

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

**The Chairperson:** This afternoon, we will continue with our work programme. As members are aware, we finished our work on the nuclear weapons cluster yesterday, including the voting process. We also heard general statements and explanations of vote before the voting.

I now call on the remaining speakers who wish to explain their votes following the voting.

**Mr. El Hadj Ali** (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): I wish to take the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.38.

There is no doubt that combating the proliferation of ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction is an endeavour that contributes to the achievement of the goal of nuclear, biological and chemical disarmament and non-proliferation. My country attaches particular importance to that issue and supports initiatives aimed at contributing to the elimination of such weapons and their vehicles.

My delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation", contained in document A/C.1/63/L.38, because that draft resolution was once again introduced without having been the subject of genuine debate among the other members of

the General Assembly and does not take into account the amendments proposed by various delegations in the course of previous meetings.

We believe that addressing the issue of missiles in a balanced, comprehensive and non-selective manner requires us to go beyond the question of their horizontal proliferation to address other no less important aspects, such as the ongoing vertical design, development, testing and deployment of such weapons.

Finally, my delegation believes that the United Nations continues to be the appropriate framework for negotiating and adopting such an important instrument, and that the Conference on Disarmament is the sole multilateral negotiating body on this question.

**Mr. Larson** (United States of America): I should like to explain the vote of the United States on draft resolutions A/C.1/63/L.2, A/C.1/63/L.5, A/C.1/63/L.27, A/C.1/63/L.40 and A/C.1/63/L.58. In the interest of time, I will be as concise as possible.

My delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". The United States believes that, again this year, the draft resolution fails to meet the fundamental tests of fairness and balance. It confines itself to expressions of concern about the activities of a single country, omitting any reference to other issues related to nuclear proliferation in the region. Furthermore, it does not allude to the steps that some States in the region parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) are taking to develop the capacity to acquire nuclear

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.



weapons and their failure to cooperate fully and transparently with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). In addition, it does not comment on the failure of some States to conclude safeguards agreements, nor does it recommend that all States in the region sign the IAEA additional safeguards protocol. Notwithstanding our negative vote, I would like to reiterate the long-standing position of the United States in support of universal adherence to the NPT.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.5, entitled "Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems", I am speaking on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom and France. We continue to disagree with the basic premise of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.5 that the current level of readiness of nuclear weapons increases the risk of their use, including through unintentional or accidental use. We would like to reiterate that the operational readiness of our respective nuclear weapons systems is maintained at a level consonant with our national security requirements and our obligations to our allies within the larger context of the current global strategic situation.

In reflection thereof, and as we have said before in the United Nations, the Conference on Disarmament and other venues, we have decreased the operational readiness and alert levels of our respective forces since the early 1990s. In addition, our respective nuclear weapons systems are no longer targeted against any State. Collectively, those steps have, in our view, reduced the value of further de-alerting as a priority for nuclear disarmament.

Unhelpfully, the draft resolution proceeds from the presumption that lowered alert levels will automatically and in all cases lead to heightened international security. In reality, while alert levels can be and have been lowered in response to an international security climate, the relationship between alert levels and security is complex and not reducible to such simple formulaic responses.

We would also like to reiterate that our nuclear weapons systems are subject to the most rigorous command and control systems to ensure against the possibility of accidental or unintentional use and to guarantee that such weapons could only be used at the sole direction of the proper national command authority.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.27, I am speaking on behalf of the United States and the United Kingdom. That draft resolution welcomes the report (A/63/176) of the Secretary-General on the results of the 2008 Panel of Governmental Experts on missiles, in which we participated. We would like to note that the report is largely descriptive in nature and clearly acknowledges the inability of the Panel to reach consensus on developing a universal approach to the issue of missiles. The Panel was the third group of its kind convened in recent years to address the issues posed by missiles, and we believe that the results of the three panels clearly show that there is no consensus within the international community on the general topic of missiles in all its aspects. We therefore believe that it would be inappropriate to convene additional United Nations panels or studies on missiles that consume scarce resources that could be better spent on more fruitful discussions. We need to stop diverting attention away from successful ongoing efforts on missile non-proliferation that have produced useful results.

We take the danger of missile proliferation very seriously. We actively participate in many of the international efforts to curb the spread of missiles and related equipment and technology, and we plan to continue to strengthen that work. Those efforts have often proven to be highly effective when conducted on a regional basis and include the active participation of those States that were directly interested and affected. We believe that that basic strategy, along with other cooperative efforts that seek to prevent the proliferation of missile technology, offers the best way forward on this issue.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.40, I am speaking on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom and France. We would like to emphasize the importance we attach to the development of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones, which can make an important contribution to regional and global security provided that they are supported by all the States of the region concerned and by nuclear-weapon States, are the subject of appropriate treaties, include comprehensive safeguards provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and were satisfactorily concluded in consultation with the nuclear-weapon States, as set out in the 1999 Disarmament Commission's guidelines. In that regard, we want to recall that we continue to stand ready to

resume consultations with the concerned States parties to nuclear-weapon-free zones treaties to reach a mutually satisfactory outcome regarding the outstanding issues.

However, with regard to this draft resolution, we still believe that it is contradictory to propose simultaneously the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone that would be composed largely of the high seas, and yet to say that it would be consistent with applicable principles and rules of international law relating to the freedom of the high seas and the right of passage of maritime space, including those of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. We therefore question whether the real goal of that draft resolution is in fact the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone covering the high seas. We do not believe that this ambiguity has been successfully clarified. For that reason, we have voted against the draft resolution again this year.

Finally, the United States considers that A/C.1/63/L.58, "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", is, of all the draft resolutions introduced on nuclear disarmament, the most balanced and realistic. In particular, we note the draft resolution's support for compliance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, its recognition of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Strategic Offensive Reductions, its call for the immediate commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty, and its positive mention of IAEA comprehensive safeguards agreements and the additional protocol.

At the same time, the United States has continued to vote against this draft resolution because of its support for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty in paragraph 9. As representatives are aware, the United States opposes that Treaty.

**Mr. Janssens de Bisthoven** (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): Belgium wishes to explain its vote in favour of resolution A/C.1/63/L.5, entitled "Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems".

Belgium's positive attitude is reflected in its co-sponsorship of A/C.1/63/L.58, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", submitted by Japan. Belgium believes, in fact, that nuclear disarmament, pursuant to article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear

Weapons (NPT), is an ultimate objective that can be reached gradually by way of concrete measures.

Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems can be one such concrete measure, provided that all nuclear Powers are effectively on board. Bearing in mind the new security climate, NATO's nuclear apparatus has been significantly reduced both in terms of numbers and in terms of operational readiness. Through its positive vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.5, Belgium calls upon all nuclear Powers that have not yet done so to take decisions to reduce their nuclear operational readiness that are as positive and ambitious as those taken by NATO.

Finally, with respect to the upcoming NPT Review Conference, Belgium wishes to contribute to making concrete progress in all areas covered by the NPT.

**The Chairperson:** We have thus concluded the consideration of draft resolutions in cluster 1.

We will now take action on cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction". The list of draft resolutions to be considered is contained in the informal paper distributed by the secretariat. We will continue in that order.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.11. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.11, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the 11th meeting of the Committee, held on 17 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/63/L.11.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.11.

Under the terms of operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.11, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin

Weapons and on Their Destruction”, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to render the necessary assistance to the depositary Governments of the Convention and to provide such services as may be required for the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Review Conferences, including all assistance to the annual meetings of the States parties and the meetings of experts.

The costs related to the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Review Conferences, including the annual meetings of the States parties and the meetings of experts, would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in those meetings, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately.

It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties, under their respective legal arrangements, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations. Such activities would be undertaken by the Secretariat only after sufficient funding was received in advance from States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in the meetings.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.11 would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.11 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.12\*. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.12\*, entitled “Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament”, was introduced by the representative of Belarus at the 11th meeting, on 17 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents

A/C.1/63/L.12\*, A/C.1/63/CRP.3 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.1 and Add.3.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, 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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, 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, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Israel.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.12\* was adopted by 165 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of Albania and Dominica informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.34. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.34, entitled “Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction”, was introduced by the representative of India at the 10th meeting, on 16 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.34, A/C.1/63/CRP.3 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.2, Add.3, Add.4 and Add.5.

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.34 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** I shall now give the floor to those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position regarding the draft resolutions just adopted.

**Mr. Tarar** (Pakistan): I understand that we are working under severe time constraints, so I shall confine myself to a brief explanation of position on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.34, which was just adopted.

We decided to join the consensus on the draft resolution. However, we should like to stress, as we did at the previous session of the General Assembly, that the fear that terrorists and other non-State actors may acquire and use weapons of mass destruction is a recent phenomenon and that this danger must be viewed in perspective. Terrorist organizations and other non-State actors are more likely to acquire and use chemical weapon and biological weapon capabilities. The acquisition and use of nuclear weapons by

terrorists and other non-State actors is much less likely, and that concern should not be used as an excuse for discrimination against selected countries. The international community must not, however, lower its guard to prevent the possibility of the development and use of “dirty bombs”. Increased international cooperation, including the initiation of negotiations on a radiological weapons convention, should be given serious consideration.

As regards denying terrorists means to acquire, possess and use weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), it is necessary that all States enact and enforce national physical protection and export control measures to prevent WMD technology from falling into the hands of terrorists. International assistance and capacity-building are areas requiring urgent attention. In order to lend greater legitimacy to international efforts in this area, interim measures — such as the adoption by the Security Council of resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006), which were designed to fill the gaps in international law — need to be taken up by a more inclusive and representative United Nations forum.

We agree with the widely held view that the best guarantee against the threat of possible use of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons is their elimination. We also believe that the faithful implementation of existing treaty regimes, such as the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, is essential.

**Ms. Rocca** (United States of America): I would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.12. Our delegation believes that the international community should focus its efforts on the very real problem of the proliferation of known types of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) both by States that wilfully violate their commitments with respect to existing treaties and by terrorists.

In the 60 years since the 1948 definition of WMDs was set forth, no new types of WMD have appeared, not even on the horizon. The idea of new types of WMD beyond chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear remains entirely hypothetical. No useful purpose is served by diverting the attention and efforts of the international community away from existing threats to such hypothetical ones. For those reasons, the United States voted against the draft resolution.

**The Chairperson:** We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote on this cluster.

The Committee has thus concluded action on cluster 2 and will now move on to cluster 3 “Outer space (disarmament aspects)”.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.4. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.4, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”, was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 12th meeting, on 20 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/63/L.4 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.3 and Add.4.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, 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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal,

Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, 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, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Israel.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.4 was adopted by 166 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of Albania and Dominica advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairperson:** I now call on delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

**Mr. Danon** (France) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.4, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”. The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Montenegro and Serbia; as well as Norway and the Republic of Moldova align themselves with this statement.

All European Union member States voted in favour of the draft resolution. The European Union believes that preventing an arms race in outer space is essential to strengthening strategic stability and to promoting international cooperation in the exploration and use of space for peaceful purposes, given the international community’s increased involvement in space activities aimed at global development and progress. As actors in the field of space, we are

particularly sensitive to the security of space objects and call on all Member States to refrain from undertaking activities liable to undermine it.

Moreover, the European Union wishes to especially emphasize the need to develop and implement transparency and confidence-building measures in space, as acknowledged in draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.4. The European Union voted unanimously in favour of the General Assembly resolutions on transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities and on prevention of an arms race in outer space. Also, it has recently forwarded its joint response to the Secretary-General with regard to the international transparency and confidence-building measures set out in resolution 62/43.

I also wish to recall that in order to contribute to strengthening good cooperation in the field of space activities, the European Union is working on a code of conduct aimed at furthering the security of activities in outer space through voluntary confidence-building and transparency measures that are acceptable to the majority of States. We are convinced that improved exchange of information and good practices will increase confidence and understanding among actors in space, thereby usefully contributing to the security of space activities. The European Union hopes soon to be in a position to propose its draft code to the international community and to conduct negotiations with nations that carry out activities or have interests in space.

However, we believe that the references and appeal to the Conference on Disarmament in the eleventh and eighteenth preambular paragraphs and in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution do not take into account the existing developments in that area, namely, on the one hand, the constructive and substantive debates that have been taking place on all the items on the agenda for more than two years and, on the other, the consecutive presentation of two draft presidential decisions on a programme of work in documents A/C.1/63/CRP.5 and A/C.1/63/CRP.6 and CD/1840, which enjoy near consensus. Those proposals continue to give us hope that deliberations within the Conference on Disarmament may resume.

The European Union remains open with regard to the formal framework within which substantive work on preventing an arms race in outer space can begin. However, as in past years, we should have liked the

draft resolution on that issue to take better note of the work of the member States of this forum and the tenor of the debates held herein.

**Mr. Tarui** (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.4, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". Addressing the issue of how to deal with the prevention of an arms race in outer space in the Conference on Disarmament must be without prejudice to and be based on the result of the ongoing discussions in the Conference on Disarmament.

**The Chairperson:** We have thus concluded action on cluster 3.

I would ask the Committee to turn to cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

I give the floor to the representative of Jordan.

**Miss Majali** (Jordan): My delegation is taking the floor on behalf of the delegations of Australia and Switzerland, sponsors of this year's draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction", which appears in document A/C.1/63/L.6 under agenda item 89, to make the following technical oral revision.

In lines 8 and 9 of paragraph 9, the meeting to be attended, which appears in the present text as "the ninth meeting of the States parties, should read "the Review Conference of the Convention". Therefore, paragraph 9 would read as follows:

"Requests the Secretary-General, in accordance with article 12, paragraph 1, of the Convention, to undertake the preparations necessary to convene the next Review Conference of the Convention and, pending a decision to be taken at the ninth meeting of the States parties, and on behalf of the States parties and in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention, to invite States not parties to the Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations to attend the Review Conference of the Convention as observers."

Since my delegation has the floor, I would like to take this opportunity once again, on behalf of the delegations of Switzerland and Australia, to express our hope that the draft resolution will receive the support it deserves, as it has at previous sessions. We hope for the continued support of those States not party to the Mine Ban Convention, but that previously supported this draft resolution in view of its humanitarian values and objectives, and we urge those that abstained to consider supporting it at this session.

**The Chairperson:** I shall now give the floor to those representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

**Mr. Douangthongla** (Lao People's Democratic Republic): I am taking the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction".

The Lao People's Democratic Republic supports the humanitarian endeavours of the Mine Ban Convention and shares the concerns regarding the impact of anti-personnel mines. In this context, we have participated in the treaty process, including in various meetings of the States party to the Convention, since its inception.

The Lao Government continues to express its interest in acceding to the treaty. However, we need additional time and resources to prepare the necessary conditions to enable us to accede to the Convention and meet all the provisions prescribed therein. In that regard, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution, as it did in 2007.

**Mr. Benítez Versón** (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As it has in previous sessions, Cuba will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction", contained in document A/C.1/63/L.6.

Cuba fully shares the legitimate humanitarian concerns associated with the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines. We are party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its Additional Protocol II, and we are in full compliance with the prohibitions and restrictions regarding the use of mines established by that Protocol.

At the same time, it is well known that Cuba has been subject to almost 50 years of a policy of continued hostility and aggression from the military super-Power. As a result, it is not possible for our country to renounce the use of mines in preserving our sovereignty and territorial integrity, in keeping with the legitimate right to self-defence recognized in the Charter of the United Nations.

Cuba will continue to support all efforts aimed at eliminating the terrible effects on the civilian population and economy of many countries of the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines, while maintaining the appropriate balance between national security and humanitarian concerns.

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.6, as orally revised. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Jordan at the 13th meeting, on 21 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/63/L.6.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I wish to put on record the following statement of financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General in connection with draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6.

Under the terms of operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, in accordance with article 12, paragraph 1, of the Convention, to undertake the preparations necessary to convene the Review Conference of the Convention and, pending a decision to be taken at the ninth meeting of States parties, and on behalf of the States parties and in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention, to invite States not parties to the Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations to attend the ninth meeting of the States parties as observers.

In accordance with article 14 of the Convention, the costs of the next Review Conference of the Convention would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in that conference, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment, adjusted appropriately. The Secretariat will prepare cost estimates for the Review Conference for the approval of the States parties, following planning missions to assess the requirements for conference facilities and services.

It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties, under their respective legal arrangements, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations. These activities would be undertaken by the Secretariat only after sufficient funding is received, in advance, from States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in the meetings.

Accordingly, adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6 would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

A few minutes ago, the representative of Jordan introduced an oral revision to the paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6, by which the words “ninth meeting of the States parties” would be replaced with the words “Review Conference of the Convention”.

*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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia,

Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

None.

*Abstaining:*

Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6, as orally revised, was adopted by 151 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.29. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is taking action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.29, entitled “Information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the 13th meeting, on 21 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in documents A/C.1/63/L.29 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.1 through 6.

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.29 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

**Ms. Kwek (Singapore):** I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction".

Singapore's position on anti-personnel landmines has been clear and open. Singapore supports and will continue to support all initiatives to combat the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines, especially when they are directed at innocent and defenceless civilians. With this in mind, in May 1996 Singapore declared a two-year moratorium on the export of anti-personnel landmines without self-neutralizing mechanisms. In February 1998, Singapore expanded the moratorium to include all manner of anti-personnel landmines, not just those without self-neutralizing mechanisms, and extended the moratorium indefinitely.

At the same time, like several other countries, Singapore firmly states that the legitimate security concerns and the right to self-defence of any State cannot be disregarded. A blanket ban on all types of anti-personnel landmines might therefore be counter-productive.

Singapore supports international efforts to resolve the humanitarian concerns over anti-personnel landmines. We will continue to work with members of the international community towards finding a durable and truly global solution.

**Mrs. Halliyadde (Sri Lanka):** I am taking the floor to explain Sri Lanka's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction".

My Government is not yet in a position to accede to the Ottawa Convention, for reasons we explained in

our statement at the fifty-second session of the First Committee. My delegation would like to reiterate that statement. Based on this explanation of vote, Sri Lanka was able to vote in favour of the draft resolution on account of its humanitarian objectives.

**Mr. Aly (Egypt):** I am taking the floor to explain Egypt's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6.

Egypt abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6 on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction due to the particularly unbalanced nature of this instrument, which was developed and concluded outside the framework of the United Nations.

Egypt acknowledges the humanitarian considerations that the Ottawa Convention attempts to embody. My country imposed a moratorium on its capacity to produce and export landmines in 1980, long before the conclusion of the Ottawa Convention.

Egypt views the Convention as lacking balance between the humanitarian concerns related to the production and use of anti-personnel landmines and their legitimate military use in border protection. Furthermore, the Convention does not acknowledge the legal responsibility of States to remove the anti-personnel mines they themselves have laid, in particular on the territory of other States, making it almost impossible for many States to meet their demining requirements alone. This is particularly true in the case of Egypt, which still has millions of anti-personnel mines on its territory that are remnants of the Second World War.

The weaknesses I have mentioned are only complemented by the weak international cooperation system of the Convention, which remains limited in its effect and highly dependent on the will of donor States. The weaknesses of the Ottawa Convention have kept the world's largest producers of landmines and those States most severely affected by these armaments outside its regime, calling into question the potential for the Convention's universality and reminding us all of the value of concluding arms control and disarmament agreements within the context of the United Nations and not outside of that framework.

**Mr. Tarar** (Pakistan): I should like briefly to go over our reasons for abstaining in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6.

Pakistan remains committed to pursuing the objectives of a universal and non-discriminatory ban on anti-personnel mines in a manner that takes into account the legitimate defence requirements of States. However, given our security compulsions and the need to guard long borders that are not protected by any natural obstacle, the use of landmines forms an important part of our self-defence strategy. As such, it is not possible for Pakistan to agree to the demands for the complete prohibition of anti-personnel landmines until such time as viable alternatives are available.

The objective of the total elimination of anti-personnel mines can best be promoted by, inter alia, making available non-lethal militarily viable and cost-effective alternate technologies. Pakistan is a party to Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which regulates the use of landmines in internal and external conflicts to prevent civilians from falling victim to landmines. We continue to implement the Protocol with the greatest sincerity. With the adoption of Protocol V on Explosive Remnants of War, efforts are under way for its ratification.

Pakistan is one of the largest troop contributors to United Nations-led peacekeeping operations and has actively contributed to demining operations in several affected countries in the past, and we stand prepared to provide training facilities to mine-affected countries. Pakistan enjoys a unique record of clearing all minefields after the three wars in South Asia. There has never been a humanitarian situation caused by the use of these mines. We remain committed to ensuring that mines in our military inventory will never become a cause for civilian casualties in Pakistan or elsewhere in the world.

**Mr. Bolourian** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction".

The Islamic Republic of Iran shares the humanitarian concerns of the States parties to the Ottawa Convention that sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6. Landmines have been used irresponsibly

by military and armed groups during civil wars in certain regions of the world, and consequently have claimed a great number of innocent lives, particularly among women and children. We welcome every effort to stop this trend.

However, the Ottawa Convention focuses mainly on humanitarian concerns while neglecting or not adequately taking into account the legitimate military requirements of many countries, particularly those with long land borders, which use anti-personnel landmines in the defence of their territories. Due to the difficulties of monitoring extensive sensitive areas by established and permanent guarding posts or effective warning systems, landmines continue to be an effective means for those countries to ensure the minimum security requirements of their borders.

Meanwhile, we believe that this defensive device should be used under strict established rules and regulations to protect civilians, and that, at the same time, more national and international efforts should be made to explore new alternatives to landmines. Moreover, international cooperation should be promoted to speed up the mine-clearance activities for reducing civilian casualties and to establish sustainable indigenous demining programmes.

While appreciating the objectives of the draft resolution, my delegation, due to its particular concerns and considerations, could not support the draft and therefore cast an abstention vote.

**Mr. Kim Bonghyun** (Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction".

As the Republic of Korea has repeatedly emphasized on various occasions, we fully sympathize with the spirit and objectives of the Ottawa Convention. We believe that this important Convention plays and will continue to play a central role in alleviating the human suffering caused by anti-personnel landmines.

However, due to the unique security situation on the Korean peninsula, we are compelled to give priority to our security concerns and are unable to accede to the Convention at this point. Therefore, we have abstained in the voting on this draft resolution.

Nevertheless, we are no less concerned about the problem associated with anti-personnel mines and are committed to mitigating the suffering they cause. The Republic of Korea exercises tight control over anti-personnel landmines and is enforcing an indefinite extension of the moratorium on their export. We have responded regularly to the annual questionnaire sponsored by the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, providing all relevant information on our landmine policies and activities.

Furthermore, the Republic of Korea has joined the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its Amended Protocol II, under which we are actively participating in a range of discussions and activities to ensure only limited and responsible use of landmines. We have also joined Protocol V on Explosive Remnants of War, which entered into force in Korea in July this year.

In addition, our Government has contributed more than \$6.5 million since 1993 to such relevant United Nations mine action programmes as the United Nations Development Programme Thematic Trust Fund, the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Clearance, and the Iraq Trust Fund of the United Nations Development Group. Our Government will continue to contribute to international efforts for mine clearance and victim assistance.

**Ms. Charbel** (Lebanon) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction".

Our delegation's abstention does not contradict our full support for and conviction in the noble human values expressed in the Convention. We respect the Ottawa Convention and believe it to be an important tool for reducing human suffering caused by anti-personnel mines. Lebanon is not at present a party to the Ottawa Convention for reasons of legitimate force majeure that have to do with our national security, given that Israel continues to occupy a part of our territory and that we are still the target of Israeli aggression. Moreover, Israel has not joined the Ottawa Convention.

The indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines against Lebanon has created victims of innocent, defenceless civilians, in particular in the southern part

of the country, where Israel has placed mines ever since its repeated aggression and occupation began decades ago.

Lebanon appreciates the assistance of non-governmental organizations, friendly nations and international organizations in the demining process in southern Lebanon. We also call for more assistance in this area in order to help the innocent against these silent lethal devices and to help life to return to normal in that disenfranchised area. Furthermore, such aid cannot and should not be linked to the signing of or accession to the Convention.

**Mr. Marrakchi** (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): My delegation wishes to make the following statement in explanation of its vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction".

First, the Moroccan delegation thanks the delegations of Jordan, Switzerland and Australia, the authors of the draft resolution, for having submitted it to the Committee once again this year, thereby keeping the draft visible and renewing the very broad support it enjoys. The Moroccan delegation welcomes the adoption of the draft resolution, which sends a new positive signal regarding the Ottawa Convention, including to States that are not yet parties to it.

Although Morocco, because of imperative and legitimate reasons of national security, is not yet a State party to the Ottawa Convention, we voted in favour of the draft resolution once again this year in keeping with our practice over the past few sessions, thereby reaffirming our commitment to the humanitarian objectives of the Ottawa Convention.

It should be stressed that the Kingdom of Morocco implements de facto many of the important provisions of the Convention. Morocco does not produce, transfer or export anti-personnel mines and had stopped importing such weapons long before the Convention entered into force. In addition, Morocco, which reaffirms its commitment to supporting the Convention's review process, has submitted a voluntary transparency report on measures taken at the national level, in accordance with the Convention's relevant provisions.

Finally, it should be stressed that in 2002, the Kingdom of Morocco ratified Amended Protocol II on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices of the Convention on Conventional Weapons, which the international community considers to be an essential instrument of international humanitarian law. Morocco's accession to Amended Protocol II is additional proof of its resolve to contribute to the fight against the scourge of anti-personnel mines.

**Mr. Rao (India):** My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6.

India supports the vision of a world free of the threat of anti-personnel landmines. Since 1997, India has discontinued the production of non-detectable anti-personnel mines and has observed a moratorium on their transfer. Since the Nairobi Review Conference of the States Parties to the Ottawa Convention, India has participated as an observer in all meetings of States parties.

However, India supports the approach enshrined in Amended Protocol II, to which it is a State party and which addresses the legitimate defence requirements of States, especially those with long borders. The availability of militarily effective alternative technologies that can cost-effectively perform the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines will considerably facilitate the achievement of the goal of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines.

India remains committed to increased international cooperation and assistance in mine clearance and the rehabilitation of mine victims, and is willing to contribute technical assistance and expertise to that end.

**Mr. Alfa Zerandouro (Benin) (*spoke in French*):** Benin voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.6 because it fully supports the spirit and the letter of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction. Benin calls for the universalization of the Convention because such weapons are now effectively banned.

Benin participates actively in the implementation of the Convention. With the cooperation of France, we have established a mine-clearance training centre, which is a regional facility available to all countries in

need of mine-clearance expertise. The centre has made it possible to ensure mine clearance in former firing ranges in Benin, and the area thus cleared is now being used to construct buildings to house the local population.

Currently, the number of countries emerging from conflict in Africa is quite high; some have been able to restore peace and must undertake greater mine-clearance efforts in affected areas to reduce the effects of conflict. Thus, the international community should invest more in mine clearance to prevent the exacerbation of post-conflict humanitarian perils. In that regard, Benin would like to benefit from increased assistance in order to strengthen the centre's capacity to host peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities.

**The Chairperson:** We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote under this cluster.

We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.57\*. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Alasaniya (Deputy Secretary of the Committee):** Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.57\*, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects", was introduced by the representative of Japan at the 13th meeting, on 21 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.57\*, A/C.1/63/CRP.3 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.1, Add.2, Add.3, Add.4, Add.5 and Add.6.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General on financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.57\*.

Under the terms of operative paragraphs 6, 13 and 14 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.57\*, the General Assembly would decide that, in conformity with the follow-up to the Programme of Action, the next biennial meeting of States to consider the national, regional and global implementation of the Programme of Action shall be held in New York for a period of one week, no later than in 2010; to convene an open-ended meeting of governmental experts for a period of one week, no later than in 2011, to address key implementation challenges and opportunities relating to particular issues and themes, including international cooperation and assistance; and also to convene a conference to review progress made in implementation

of the Programme of Action for a period of two weeks in New York, no later than in 2012.

Pursuant to operative paragraphs 6 and 14 of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the biennial meeting of States would hold one session of one week's duration in New York no later than in 2010 and one session of two weeks' duration in New York no later than in 2012. The conference services requirements for these sessions of meetings of States are estimated to be \$259,800 at current rates in 2010 and \$429,500 at current rates in 2012. These requirements will be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget at the bienniums 2010-2011 and 2012-2013.

With respect to paragraph 13 of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the General Assembly would convene an open-ended meeting of governmental experts for a period of one week, no later than 2011. The conference servicing requirements for an open-ended meeting of governmental experts are estimated to be \$234,900 at current rates in 2011. These requirements will be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.57\*, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

A recorded vote has been requested. A separate recorded vote has been requested for each of operative paragraphs 4 and 13 of the draft resolution. The Committee will take action on those paragraphs in that order, and then we will vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

The Committee will now take a separate vote on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.57, which reads as follows:

“Endorses the report adopted at the Third Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, and encourages all States to implement the measures highlighted in the section of the report entitled ‘The way forward’”.

*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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, 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, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

None.

*Abstaining:*

Iran (Islamic Republic of), United States of America.

*Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 164 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on operative paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.57. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a separate vote on operative paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.57, which reads as follows:

*“Decides to convene an open-ended meeting of governmental experts for a period of one week, no later than in 2011, to address key implementation challenges and opportunities relating to particular issues and themes, including international cooperation and assistance.”*

*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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint

Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, 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, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Iran (Islamic Republic of).

*Operative paragraph 13 was retained by 164 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.57 as a whole. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.57, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”, as a whole.

*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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India,

Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, 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), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

United States of America.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.57 as a whole was adopted by 166 votes to 1.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of Japan and Thailand advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairperson:** I now call on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

**Mr. Bolourian** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain my delegation's position regarding draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.57, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

My delegation expressed its views and considerations on some specific paragraphs of the draft

resolution in a transparent manner in the informal consultation meeting held by the authors of the text. In that meeting and afterwards, we urged the drafters to find a compromise solution to the contentious issues. Unfortunately, the authors of the draft failed to do so.

We note the following concerns. First, regarding operative paragraph 4, we believe that the applied procedure and method of work on the draft outcome of the Third Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action fell far short of General Assembly standards and principles, including transparency and inclusiveness. Since such a procedure was harmful and could create an unjustifiable precedent for future meetings and negotiations in the disarmament area within the United Nations framework, my delegation was not able to agree with a draft outcome that had not been negotiated in an inclusive and transparent manner.

In that context, we regret that the leadership of the Third Biennial Meeting failed to perform the function, required under the rules of procedure of the meeting, to make every effort to facilitate the achievement of general agreement on substantive matters. Therefore, my delegation cannot go along with the endorsement of the outcome of the Third Biennial Meeting, as stipulated in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. At the same time, operative paragraph 13, which contains a selective approach in dealing with the Programme of Action, is not acceptable to us either.

Nevertheless, I would like to emphasize that Iran attaches great importance to combating the trafficking of small arms and light weapons, has actively and constructively participated in the relevant meetings and negotiations on the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, and will continue to do so in the hope that the unpleasant methods of work implemented in the Third Biennial Meeting will not be repeated in future meetings on this issue.

**Mr. Benítez Versón** (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.57, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects". We regret that, given the position of just one delegation, it was not possible to achieve consensus on the draft resolution as a whole.

We believe that the text appropriately reflects a clear strategy for preventing, combating and eradicating the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects. The draft resolution correctly identifies the 2001 Programme of Action as the main framework for the adoption measures within the said strategy. There has been progress in the implementation of the Programme of Action, but much remains to be done. We therefore welcome the fact that the draft resolution includes a follow-up mechanism with the convening of several meetings for the period 2010-2012.

The draft resolution that we have adopted, although not perfect, takes into account the primary proposals and concerns set out during consultations by the Cuban delegation, which has allowed us to continue supporting it. At the same time, we would like to affirm our position that the ninth preambular paragraph should not be understood as establishing a priority with regard to regional implementation of the Programme of Action to the detriment of its implementation at the national and international levels.

We believe that the key to the successful implementation of the Programme lies in maintaining a multidimensional and balanced approach in which actions at the national, regional and international levels are complementary and mutually reinforcing.

**Ms. Rocca** (United States): I take the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.57.

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 continue to uphold 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 its implementation, including the destruction of surplus weapons, the development and enforcement of arms export and import control policies and better stockpiling management. We believe that is most effectively done at the national, subregional and regional levels.

Such meaningful steps require additional meetings. That said, the United States notes with appreciation the efforts of the Chair of the most recent

Biennial Meeting of States to produce a result that focuses on the practical implementation of the Programme of Action. While the United States remains ready and able to assist other States in fulfilling their obligations under the Programme, we uphold the view, first expressed in 2001, that a perpetual series of costly meetings is not required to achieve this and is unlikely to advance the real objectives of the draft resolution. Therefore, we voted no.

**The Chairperson:** We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions under cluster 4.

The Committee will now turn to take action on cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security".

The Committee will take action on draft decision A/C.1/63/L.3. I call on the Deputy Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/63/L.3, entitled "Maintenance of international security — good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe", was submitted by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia on 14 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.3 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3 and Add.3.

**The Chairperson:** The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/63/L.3 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft decision A/C.1/63/L.3 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** The Committee has thus finished taking action on cluster 5.

The Committee will now turn to draft resolutions submitted under cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

I call on the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, who wishes to introduce a revision to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.47.

**Ms. Ancidey** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to speak on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", contained in document A/C.1/63/L.47, to introduce the following revisions.

In the third line of the sixth preambular paragraph, the phrase “Presidents of the Conference for the 2008 session” should be replaced by “2008 Presidents of the Conference”. In the fifth line, the phrase “for the 2008 session” should be removed. In the first line of the ninth preambular paragraph, the word “declaration” should be replaced by the word “address”.

**The Chairperson:** I call on the representative of Turkey, who wishes to make a general statement on draft resolutions under cluster 7.

**Mr. Çobanoğlu** (Turkey): Before the Committee takes action on the draft resolutions under this cluster, my delegation wishes to make a few observations about draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.47, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

As we emphasized in our statement in the general debate of the First Committee on 9 October 2008, as well as during the thematic discussion on 24 October 2008, Turkey fully supports efforts aimed at helping the Conference on Disarmament to resume its negotiating role as the world’s sole multilateral disarmament forum.

As one of the 2008 Presidents of the Conference on Disarmament, Turkey believes that the Conference has a major role to play with regard to nuclear issues, a fissile material cut-off treaty and parallel advances on negative security assurances and the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

We regard the proposal concerning a programme of work as a good means for the Conference on Disarmament to resume its negotiating role. Yet, the draft resolution, which has been adopted by consensus for many years, includes a reference to the question of the expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament. As stated in the 2008 report of the Conference, to which this draft resolution pertains, the views of the member States on the issue of the expansion of the Conference on Disarmament membership are reflected in the verbatim record of the Conference.

In that respect, my delegation wishes to reiterate that the question of the expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament is not a priority at this stage and should be addressed on a case-by-case basis, with due consideration to be given to the

contributions of those candidates to international peace and security.

For that reason, I would like to underline that the last preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.47 should not be construed as indicating a change in Turkey’s well-known position on this question.

**The Chairperson:** I now give the floor to the representative of the Netherlands to introduce a revision to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.48.

**Mr. Landman** (Netherlands): On behalf of the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission and following consultations with the members of the Bureau, I should like to introduce an oral revision to paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.48, which has been proposed by the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement and ad referendum agreed to by the Chairman.

Paragraph 8 should read as follows:

“Also recommends that the Disarmament Commission intensify consultations with a view to reaching agreement on the remaining agenda items, in accordance with decision 52/492, before the start of its substantive session of 2009.”

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.47, as orally revised. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.47, which is entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”, was introduced, under sub-item (b) of agenda item 91, entitled “Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session”, by the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela at the 17th meeting of the Committee, on 24 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.47.

A few minutes ago, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela introduced oral revisions to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.47, by which, in the sixth preambular paragraph, the words “Presidents of the Conference for the 2008 session” would be replaced by the words “2008 Presidents of the Conference” and the phrase “for the 2008 session”

would be deleted. By the second revision, the word “declaration” in the ninth preambular paragraph would be replaced by “address”.

**The Chairperson:** The sponsors have expressed the wish that the draft resolution, as orally revised, be adopted by the Committee without being put to the vote. If I hear no objection, we shall act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.47, as orally revised, was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.48, as orally revised.

I give the floor to the representative of the United States, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.48.

**Ms. Rocca** (United States of America): I promise to keep my statement brief.

The United States will not participate in the Committee’s action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.48 on the report of the Disarmament Commission.

**The Chairperson:** I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.48, which is entitled “Report of the Disarmament Commission”, was introduced, under sub-item (a) of agenda item 91, entitled “Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session”, by the representative of the Netherlands at the 17th meeting, on 24 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.48 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.6.

The representative of the Netherlands has just introduced an oral revision, by which paragraph 8 would read as follows:

“Also recommends that the Disarmament Commission intensify consultations with a view to reaching agreement on the remaining agenda items, in accordance with decision 52/492, before the start of its substantive session of 2009.”

**The Chairperson:** The sponsors have expressed the wish that the draft resolution, as orally revised, be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.48, as orally revised, was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions or decision just adopted.

**Mr. Benítez Versón** (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As in previous sessions, Cuba has supported the draft resolution entitled “Report of the Disarmament Commission”, which this year is contained in document A/C.1/63/L.48. We regret that, once again, the delegation of the United States did not participate in the action on that important draft resolution.

We are especially pleased with the oral revision that was introduced to paragraph 8, by which an explicit reference is made to decision 52/492. The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) has proposed a concrete agenda for the Disarmament Commission’s work beginning in 2009, which Cuba fully supports. In line with the Movement’s proposal, the Disarmament Commission would begin next year to consider the following two items: “Recommendations for achieving the goal of disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons” and “Elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade”.

In paragraph 7, the draft resolution we have just adopted recommends one of the two items proposed by NAM. We believe it important that agreement be reached as soon as possible on a second item for the Commission’s agenda. In that regard, we hope that the second item proposed by the Non-Aligned Movement will enjoy the support of all delegations, given that it is fully consistent with the provisions of decision 52/492.

**Mr. Langeland** (Norway): Norway joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.47, on the Conference on Disarmament. However, let me reiterate my delegation’s impatience with the current state of affairs in the Conference. That body has not delivered anything of substance for more than 11 years. We also question the notion that the Conference is the “sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum” of the international community. Indeed, important progress has been achieved in other forums, where all States have been invited to take part in negotiations. With its 65 member States, the Conference on Disarmament is far from universal. A credible and relevant multilateral negotiating body should be open to any country. As expressed in our statement last week, if the Conference

on Disarmament remains paralysed, there will be stronger calls to consider optional avenues in order to move the disarmament agenda forward.

**The Chairperson:** We have thus concluded action on the draft resolutions listed in informal paper 1.

We shall now continue with the draft resolutions listed in informal paper 2, beginning with draft resolutions under cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”.

The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.14. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.14, which is entitled “Nuclear disarmament”, was introduced, under sub-item (v) of agenda item 89, entitled “General and complete disarmament”, by the representative of Myanmar at the 10th meeting, on 16 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.14 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.4 and Add.5.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland,

Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, India, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Montenegro, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Serbia, Sweden, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.14 was adopted by 104 votes to 44, with 21 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Barbados advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Montenegro advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.]

**The Chairperson:** We shall now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.37. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.37, which is entitled “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia”, was submitted, under sub-item (i) of agenda item 89, entitled “General and complete disarmament”, was submitted by the representative of Kyrgyzstan. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/63/L.37.

*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, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia,

Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.37 was adopted by 128 votes to 3, with 36 abstentions.*

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

**The Chairperson:** I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to explain their votes on the draft resolutions just adopted.

**Mr. Tarui** (Japan): I would like to explain our vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/63/L.14 and A/C.1/63/L.37.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.14, Japan shares the same ultimate goal of the draft resolution — the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In that regard, my delegation takes note of positive elements concerning nuclear disarmament in the draft resolution. My delegation appreciates the fact that it contains a reference to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as the cornerstone of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, agreed in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference.

However, the draft resolution does not contain elements that are necessary for the international community, including nuclear-weapon States, to arrive at an agreement towards nuclear disarmament. My delegation firmly believes that steps towards nuclear disarmament should be realistic and progressive and involve nuclear-weapon States. My delegation would therefore like to see a different approach to the shared goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons from that proposed in the draft resolution. That is the reason for Japan's abstention in the voting on the draft resolution.

I should now like to make a few remarks on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.37. I do so on behalf of the following eight delegations, which all voted in favour of the draft resolution: Austria, Ireland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Malta, New Zealand, Sweden and Switzerland.

Our eight delegations regard the signing of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia on 8 September 2006 as an effort to strengthen peace and stability in the region and a contribution to nuclear

disarmament and non-proliferation. Such a zone would be the first regional nuclear-weapon-free zone in the northern hemisphere and would encompass an area where nuclear weapons previously existed.

As stipulated in the principles and guidelines of the 1999 report of the Disarmament Commission, it is important that the five nuclear-weapon States be consulted during the negotiation of each treaty establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone. That facilitates their signature and ratification of the relevant protocols to such treaties. In that regard, we took note of the expressed readiness of the five Central Asian States to continue consultations on a number of the Treaty's provisions. We will pay close attention to those future consultations among States directly concerned, as outlined in paragraph 2 of the resolution before us.

The forward-looking approach is an important element of the future role of the Treaty and of strengthening peace and stability in the region. We encourage such consultations to take place as soon as possible, in the hope that progress will be possible in the near future. In that regard, we would like to encourage the five Central Asian States to keep countries with an interest in that process informed about developments in their consultations.

**Mr. Tarar** (Pakistan): I take the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.14, entitled "Nuclear disarmament".

Achieving nuclear disarmament is a goal that Pakistan has always supported. We agree with a number of the elements contained in the draft resolution, including negative security assurances. However, we remain convinced that the draft resolution's references to documents and recommendations of the Review Conferences of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) are unwarranted. We therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution, in keeping with our well-known position on the NPT.

**Mr. Manfredi** (Italy): I wish to explain Italy's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.37, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia".

We subscribe to the reference to nuclear-weapon-free zones contained in the statement delivered in the First Committee on 14 October 2008 on behalf of the

European Union presidency. We would also like to point out that article VII of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons states that nothing in the Treaty affects the right of any group of States to conclude regional treaties in order to assure the total absence of nuclear weapons on their respective territories. We also acknowledge the importance for peace and security of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely entered into between the States of a region concerned.

In that spirit, we welcomed the decision of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia. We encourage those countries to continue consultations on the Treaty and on article 1 of its protocol.

**Mr. Rao** (India): I have requested the floor to convey our position on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.14, entitled "Nuclear disarmament".

India shares the main objective of the draft resolution, which is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons within a specific time frame. However, we were compelled to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution because of certain references to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, on which India's position is well known.

However, our abstention should not be seen as opposition to other provisions of the draft resolution that we believe are consistent with the position of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and India's national positions on nuclear disarmament — including references to the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, NAM summit statements, the International Court of Justice advisory opinion, the objective of eliminating nuclear weapons within a specific time frame, the establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament as the highest priority, and the call for the convening of an international conference on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects at an early date to identify and deal with concrete nuclear disarmament measures.

**Ms. Rocca** (United States of America): I take the floor on behalf of the delegations of France, the United Kingdom and the United States to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.37.

The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States have been in touch with the five Central Asian States on a number of occasions to express our concerns about the inadequacy of consultations in the development of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia. Ever since the December 2002 consultations at the United Nations between the five Central Asian States and the five permanent members of the Security Council, we have made known our availability for further consultations. We put substantive questions to the five Central Asian States during the 2002 consultations. We resubmitted those questions in writing on 8 November 2005, and raised them again before the signing of the Treaty on 8 September 2006. The answers to those questions are key to allowing us to resolve outstanding issues and arrive at a mutually satisfactory outcome.

Our primary reservation concerning the Treaty remains article 12, which indicates that existing treaty obligations of the States parties would not be affected by this new nuclear-weapon-free zone Treaty. We have never been given a satisfactory rationale for the article. The provisions of this new Treaty must take precedence over any pre-existing treaty obligations that would fundamentally undermine its objective; otherwise the Treaty will have little meaning. By signing the Treaty, with three States subsequently ratifying it, the five Central Asian States have frozen the text and made future adjustments to it more difficult.

We would have preferred that they had not submitted a draft resolution in the First Committee before we were able to resolve those issues. For those reasons, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States are not in a position to endorse the Treaty signed on 8 September 2006, nor can we adhere to any protocol based upon it. Our delegations therefore had to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.37. Nevertheless, we continue to stand ready to consult with the five Central Asian States to arrive at a mutually satisfactory outcome.

**The Chairperson:** We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote.

I wish to inform members that only one draft resolution from cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”, remains for the Committee to take action on. I hope we can tackle that as soon as possible.

We shall now continue with draft resolutions listed in informal paper 2. The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.17\*. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is taking action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.17\*, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Poland at the 12th meeting, on 20 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/63/L.17\*.

**The Chairperson:** The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.17\* have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.17\* was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** We shall now move on to cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”. I call on the representative of Mali, who wishes to make a general statement in that connection.

**Mrs. Diallo** (Mali) (*spoke in French*): I am taking the floor on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.41, entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them”.

That document expresses the political will of the member States of the Economic Community of West African States to create the appropriate security conditions within their space so as to better focus on the challenge of development. The draft resolution also reflects the resolve of numerous countries in Africa beyond the West African subregion and across the world to combat the illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons and their collection.

It bears recalling that the draft resolution entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them” has always been adopted without a vote, thanks to the endorsement of our Committee. Following that logic, the sponsors of the draft resolution hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus again this year.

The draft resolution calls upon the international community to strengthen the capacity of civil society organizations, in cooperation with national commissions to combat the illicit proliferation of small arms and light weapons, to fight against the illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons and their collection, and to support the implementation of the Economic Community of West African States Convention on Small Arms and Light Weapons, Their Ammunition and Other Related Materials.

The sponsors sincerely thank the First Committee for their supporting of the draft resolution for several years now. This year, over 80 countries are sponsoring the draft, which clearly demonstrates their interest in the issue of small arms and light weapons. The world needs security and peace, and the adoption of the draft resolution will be a significant step towards that.

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.31\*. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is taking action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.31\*, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 14th meeting, on 21 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/63/L.31\*.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement of the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications accompanying draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.31.

Under the terms of paragraphs 11 and 12 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the Second Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol V, to be held on 10 and 11 November 2008, for the Tenth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, to be held on 12 November 2008, and for the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention, to be held on 13 and 14 November 2008, as well as for any continuation of work after the meetings. The General Assembly

would also request the Secretary-General, in his capacity as depositary of the Convention and the Protocols thereto, to continue to inform the General Assembly periodically, by electronic means, of ratifications and acceptances of and accessions to the Convention, its amended article 1 and the Protocols thereto.

The Secretary-General wishes to draw the attention of Member States to the fact that the respective cost estimates for the servicing of three meetings of the States parties, to be held from 10 to 14 November 2008, have been prepared by the Secretariat and approved by the Ninth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, held in Geneva on 6 November 2007; by the First Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol V, held in Geneva on 5 November 2007; and by the Meeting of High Contracting Parties to the Convention, held in Geneva from 7 to 15 November 2007.

The Secretary-General also wishes to draw the attention of Member States to the fact that the cost of the Tenth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, the Second Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol V and the Meeting of High Contracting Parties to the Convention would be borne by the States parties and States not party to the Convention that participate in the three meetings, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment, adjusted appropriately.

The request that the Secretary-General render the necessary assistance and provide services for the Tenth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, the Second Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol V and the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention should thus have no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations.

Following the established practice, the Secretariat will prepare cost estimates for any continuation of the work after the meetings for the approval of the high contracting parties. It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties are, under their respective legal arrangements, to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations. These activities would be undertaken by the Secretariat only after sufficient funding is received, in

advance, from States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in the meetings.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.31\* would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.31\* was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.41. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.41, entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them”, was introduced by the representative of Mali on behalf of the States members of the United Nations that are members of the Economic Community of West African States at the 13th meeting, on 21 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.41 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3\*\* and Addenda 2 to 5. In addition, Andorra has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.41 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** We shall now move on to cluster 5, “Regional disarmament and security”. I call on those representatives who wish to make general statements.

**Mr. Antonio** (Angola) (*spoke in French*): My delegation is taking the floor with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.46, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”.

It will be recalled that the Permanent Representative of Angola took the floor in the First Committee’s general debate to underscore clearly the importance that the subregion’s Member States attach to the implementation of the Sao Tome Initiative with respect to the drafting of a legal instrument on the control of small arms and light weapons in Central Africa and of a code of conduct for defence and security forces in Central Africa, to mention just those two confidence-building measures.

The draft resolution takes as its guiding principle that of general and complete disarmament adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, which was the first of its kind to be dedicated to disarmament.

As is noted in the draft resolution, progress has been made in the adoption of the Sao Tome Initiative, particularly the decision by the twenty-seventh ministerial meeting of the Standing Advisory Committee, held in Luanda in May, to complete the process of drafting the code of conduct with a view to its possible adoption during the twenty-eighth ministerial meeting and the decision to examine the text containing elements drawn from relevant legal instruments on small arms.

The problems of security in Central Africa are well known and of concern in several respects. We therefore have every interest in giving them special attention. Confidence-building measures are thus in keeping with the efforts of the Committee members to shoulder their responsibilities. They should be encouraged to that end, including by providing them with material and financial support so that they can achieve the goals of regional disarmament. We encourage the Committee to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.46 by consensus, as it did at the preceding session.

**Mr. Danon** (France) (*spoke in French*): It is my honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.18, entitled “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”.

The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Albania and Montenegro, members of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates; as well as Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova align themselves with this statement.

The European Union welcomes draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.18, which all of its member States have co-sponsored and which we hope will be adopted without a vote. The European Union attaches great importance to security, non-proliferation and disarmament questions in the Mediterranean region.

As the General Assembly has recognized and as specified in the European Union Strategy against Proliferation of Weapons Of Mass Destruction, adopted by the European Council in December 2003, security in Europe is closely related to security and stability in the Mediterranean region, as well as to international peace and security. The European Union particularly wishes to underscore its commitment to the provisions of the draft resolution welcoming the efforts deployed by the Euro-Mediterranean countries to combat terrorism in all its forms, in particular by the adoption of the Euro-Mediterranean Code of Conduct on Countering Terrorism in Barcelona in November 2005, and the arrangements made for its implementation.

The satisfaction that we have expressed in past years for prior decisions of the Libyan Government concerning its materiel, equipment and programmes relating to weapons of mass destruction still holds today. In this regard, the European Union welcomes the fact that the implementation of the Additional Protocol and transparency measures going beyond that instrument have enabled the International Atomic Energy Agency to conclude that there are no further pending issues concerning verification in Libya, and that inspections could be pursued in a routine manner.

With respect to the evolution of the Euro-Mediterranean process, as the draft resolution underscores we welcome the progress represented by adoption of the joint Declaration of the Paris Summit on 13 July 2008, which launched a reinforced partnership in the form of the Union for the Mediterranean. We are convinced that this progress constitutes a new stage in converting the Mediterranean region into a peaceful, democracy, cooperative and developing area. This strengthened partnership profits by the gains of the Barcelona process relative to commitments concerning the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, confidence-building measures and the fight against terrorism.

The European Union reiterates its appeal to those States of the Mediterranean region that have not yet

done so to become parties to all legally binding and multilaterally negotiated instruments in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation in order to strengthen peace and cooperation in the region.

**The Chairperson:** I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan to introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/63/L.8, A/C.1/63/L.9 and A/C.1/63/L.10.

**Mr. Tarar** (Pakistan): I shall deliver an abbreviated version of my consolidated statement introducing three draft resolutions. The full text will be distributed to delegations for the record.

I have taken the floor to introduce the draft resolutions entitled “Regional disarmament”, “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels” and “Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context”, contained in documents A/C.1/63/L.8, A/C.1/63/L.9 and A/C.1/63/L.10, respectively. First, I shall introduce the draft resolution on regional disarmament, on behalf of the delegations of Bangladesh, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Jordan, Kuwait, Nepal, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Turkey and my own delegation.

While there is no denying the importance of international disarmament measures, the regional dimension is unquestionably significant as well. The promotion of security and disarmament at the regional level can redound to the benefit of those objectives at the global level. In that regard, the guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security, adopted by the Disarmament Commission in 1993, can show us the way.

Keeping in view the promise of the regional approach to resolving conflicts in various regions, the draft resolution takes note of proposals for disarmament at the regional and subregional levels. It recognizes the linkage between regional disarmament and enhanced security, taking into account the specific characteristics of each region and the principle of undiminished security at the lowest level of armaments.

The sponsors and my delegation hope that, as at the sixty-second session of the General Assembly, the draft resolution will be adopted unanimously.

Allow me now to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.9, entitled

“Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”, on behalf of the delegations of Bangladesh, Belarus, Egypt, Malaysia, Nepal, Peru, the Syrian Arab Republic, Italy, Spain, Ukraine and my own delegation.

This draft resolution is aimed at promoting conventional disarmament at the regional and subregional levels. Despite its significance, that issue has not received due attention or support. The international community needs to be sharply focused on conventional balance and arms control.

The sponsors look forward to the Committee’s strong support for this draft resolution as well.

Now I would like to introduce the draft resolution entitled “Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context”, contained in document A/C.1/63/L.10, on behalf of the delegations of Bangladesh, Kuwait, Malaysia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine and my own delegation.

In large measure, global peace and security depend on stability at the regional and subregional levels. The absence of the latter prerequisite spawns arms races, undermines arms control and disarmament, and obstructs and complicates the peaceful settlement of disputes. Such instability also breeds poverty, despair and anger.

Our submission of this draft resolution is driven by the internationally recognized value of regional and subregional confidence-building measures. Pakistan is convinced that such measures have yielded and will continue to yield peace and conflict resolution dividends, which in turn will allow States to concentrate on socio-economic development. Confidence-building measures can also create an enabling ambience for arms control and disarmament.

My delegation hopes that, as was the case last year, the draft resolution will be unanimously adopted by the Committee.

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.8. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.8, entitled “Regional disarmament”, was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the present meeting, the

20th. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.8 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.3.

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.8 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.9. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.9, entitled “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”, was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the present meeting, the 20th. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.9 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.1, Add.3 and Add.5. In addition, the Dominican Republic has become a sponsor.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco,

Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, 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, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

India.

*Abstaining:*

Bhutan.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.9 was adopted by 166 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

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

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.10. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.10, entitled “Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context”, was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the present meeting, the 20th. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.10 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.3 and Add.6. In addition, Marshall Islands has become a sponsor.

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.10 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.18. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.18, entitled “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”, was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the 17th meeting, on 24 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.18, A/C.1/63/CRP.3 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.3 and Add.4.

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.18 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.46. I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.46, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”, was introduced by the representative of Angola at the 17th meeting, on 24 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/63/L.46.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.46.

Under the terms of operative paragraphs 8, 9 and 11 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.46, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to continue their assistance to the countries of Central Africa in tackling the problems of refugees and displaced persons in their territories; request the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to continue to provide their full assistance for the proper functioning of the Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa; and request the

Secretary-General to continue to support the ongoing efforts of the States members of the Standing Advisory Committee, including through provision of the assistance needed to ensure the success of their regular biannual meetings.

The implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, regarding the provision of assistance to the countries of Central Africa in tackling the problems of refugees and displaced persons in their territories, would be subject to the availability of voluntary contributions to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

The implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, regarding the provision of full assistance for the proper functioning of the Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa, would be carried out within the resources provided under section 23, "Human rights", of the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

The implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 11 of the draft resolution, regarding the provision of assistance to the States members of the Standing Advisory Committee, would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, "Disarmament", of the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.46, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. The attention of the Committee is drawn to provisional section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.46 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** I shall now give the floor to those representatives wishing to make statements in

explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

**Mr. Elgannas** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to speak in explanation of its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.18, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

The fact that we joined the consensus on the draft resolution does not mean that we agree with all of its provisions, in particular its fifth preambular paragraph, which welcomes the adoption of the joint Declaration of the Paris Summit on the Union for the Mediterranean. In fact, Libya did not participate in the Paris Summit because the European side did not provide for the participation of Arab States bordering the Mediterranean in that meeting or in the preparation of the Declaration. Similarly, whereas that initiative was not limited to European States bordering the Mediterranean, but involved all European States, it included only those southern Mediterranean States bordering the Mediterranean, without including all members of the League of Arab States and the African Union. Nevertheless, we joined the consensus.

We hope that the sponsors of the draft resolution will take our viewpoint into account in the future.

**Mrs. Ancidey** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.9, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels", because we are convinced that, if we are to achieve international peace and security, it is essential to promote general and complete disarmament and weapons non-proliferation. These must be addressed through a comprehensive and balanced approach that takes into account the particular security characteristics of countries as well as of various geographic regions and subregions.

In that connection, our country believes that initiatives in the area of conventional arms control should under no circumstances underestimate the security and defence concerns of States in the light of their respective regional and subregional political realities, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, including the right to legitimate self-defence. Likewise, the right of States to determine their security and

defence priorities and needs in a free and sovereign manner must be respected.

Moreover, we highlight our firm conviction that any international effort aimed at strengthening cooperation in the area of conventional arms control should take into account the true priorities of disarmament, in which weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, continue to pose the greatest threat to international peace and security.

**Mr. Rao** (India): I have requested the floor to explain my vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.9, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels". The draft resolution requests the Conference on Disarmament to consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control.

Since India believes that the Conference, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has the vocation of negotiating disarmament instruments of global application, my delegation voted against the draft resolution. Moreover, already in 1993, the Disarmament Commission had adopted by consensus guidelines and recommendations for regional disarmament.

There is no need, therefore, for the Conference on Disarmament to engage in formulating principles on the same subject at a time when it has several other priority issues on its agenda. Furthermore, we believe that the security concerns of States often extend beyond narrowly defined regions. Consequently, the idea of preservation of a balance in defence capabilities in the regional or subregional context is both unrealistic and unacceptable to our delegation.

**The Chairperson:** We have thus concluded our consideration of the second part of cluster 5. We will continue the voting process tomorrow.

I now call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

**Mr. Hallak** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): We listened to our colleague, the Deputy Permanent Representative of France to the Conference on Disarmament, who spoke on behalf of the European Union yesterday, 28 October 2008, in explanation of vote on the draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", contained in

document A/C.1/63/L.2. In this respect, we wish to recall the two statements we made in right of reply in the First Committee on 6 and 14 October 2008, respectively. Allow me to add the following points.

First, I advise my colleague to turn to the yearbook issued by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute on arms control, disarmament and international security, in which the Institute states, as it has done in each of its yearbooks for decades, that my country, Syria, and all the Arab States, and the States of the Middle East, acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) long ago in the 1960s and 1970s. The only exception in this respect is Israel. Therefore, the call by the representative of France for the States of the region to accede to the NPT was out of place and totally incorrect, and, for reasons unknown, declined to mention Israel by name.

Secondly, it is no secret that the Israeli nuclear arsenal exceeds the British and is close in size to the French. The delivery vectors for these nuclear weapons have been made available to Israel with the direct help of Western, European and non-European States that claim to be committed to nuclear non-proliferation.

Thirdly, I wish to remind our colleague that her country, France, was the first to introduce nuclear weapons into our area when, at the end of the 1950s, it provided Israel with the Dimona nuclear reactor, which is capable of producing nuclear weapons. But it is only fair to add that France is no longer the only country that helps Israel to produce and develop weapons of mass destruction (WMDs).

Fourthly, we and other colleagues will be happy to hear the representatives of those States that help Israel to produce and acquire nuclear weapons deliver a courageous statement in which they admit their guilt and seek to atone for it.

Fifthly, the only positive way to help the States of the area to free themselves of WMDs, above all nuclear weapons, is to urge Israel to accede to the NPT as a non-nuclear party and to place all its nuclear installations under the IAEA's international control.

**The Chairperson:** I now give the floor to the Deputy Secretary to make an announcement.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Yesterday, I made an announcement about oral statements that have been issued already, and

would now like to add to that list. Hard copies of oral statements on draft resolutions A/C.1/63/L.45, “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”; A/C.1/63/L.51, “Transparency in armaments”; A/C.1/63/L.56, “Convention on Cluster Munitions”; and A/C.1/63/L.57, “The illicit trade in

small arms and light weapons in all its aspects” can now be obtained on the twenty-ninth floor of the Secretariat building, at the Office of General Assembly Affairs. Participants are invited to pick them up if they are so interested.

*The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.*