



# General Assembly

Sixty-third session

## First Committee

**22**<sup>nd</sup> meeting

Friday, 31 October 2008, 10 a.m.  
New York

*Official Records*

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

*The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.*

### Agenda items 81 to 96 (continued)

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

**The Chairperson:** We will now continue to take action on draft resolutions listed in informal paper 4. In conformity with the usual practice, we will start with cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons". I invite delegations that wish to make general statements on this cluster to take the floor.

**Mr. Kang Myong Chol** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to clarify its position with regard to paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.30, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

The Democratic People's Republic's withdrawal from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) was an exercise of a legitimate right under article X of the Treaty. To be specific, our withdrawal from the NPT was an inevitable choice given the systematic nuclear threat against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Therefore, it is logical that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's return to the NPT will be possible only after the total elimination of the hostile policy against it.

According to the 19 September Joint Statement adopted at the Six-Party Talks in 2005, which is the

road map to the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea committed itself to returning to the NPT and to the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards provided that the nuclear issue of the Korean peninsula is fundamentally resolved through the full implementation of obligations by each concerned party on the principle of action for action.

If the Joint Statement is faithfully implemented by each individual party, all pending issues, including the return of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the NPT, would be duly addressed.

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.30. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 4. I give the floor the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.30, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the 10th meeting, on 16 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.30 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.2, Add.3\*, Add.4 and Add.5\*.

A separate recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.30, which reads as follows:

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.



*“Reiterates its call upon all States parties to spare no effort to achieve the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and in this regard urges India, Israel and Pakistan to accede to the Treaty as non-nuclear-weapon States promptly and without conditions”.*

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

India, Israel, Pakistan, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Bhutan, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea,

France, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 138 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of Bahamas, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ethiopia, Jordan, Niger and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairperson:** We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.30 as a whole.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, 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, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates,

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

*Against:*

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, India, Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Bhutan, Latvia, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.30 was adopted by 141 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of Armenia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Jordan, Niger, United Republic of Tanzania and Uzbekistan 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.

**Ms. Rocca** (United States of America): Although my delegation voted against this draft resolution, our vote in no way detracts from the firm commitment of the United States to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). As President Bush said on the occasion of the Treaty's fortieth anniversary on 1 July, the United States strongly supports the Treaty and is committed to working diligently to strengthen it further. We remain firmly committed to continued compliance with our own obligations under the NPT.

The United States voted no because it believes that the present draft resolution does not fully reflect the need to address all important elements of the NPT, including non-proliferation and cooperation on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Also, the United States does not support the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and believes that some elements of the documents agreed upon at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences of the Parties to the NPT have been overtaken by events.

Despite our vote, there are many elements in the draft resolution that the United States strongly supports. It supports universality of the NPT, including North Korea's return at an early date to the Treaty and to its safeguards agreement under the International Atomic Energy Agency. The United States also supports the resolution on the Middle East adopted at

the 1995 Review Conference and is working with States within and outside the region to implement it.

We agree that it is important that NPT parties intensify their constructive engagement in the work of the Preparatory Committee for the 2010 Review Conference, including identifying and addressing specific aspects of the Treaty on which urgent progress is required. We agree that there is a need for a constructive and successful review process, which should help strengthen the Treaty in all its aspects and achieve its full implementation and universality. As it has in the past, the United States has been engaging its fellow NPT parties for these purposes, including here in New York over the past few weeks, and will continue to do so.

**Mr. Wang Qun** (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Committee has already voted on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.14, entitled "Nuclear disarmament"; A/C.1/63/L.30, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments"; and A/C.1/63/L.58, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". All those draft resolutions concern nuclear disarmament, and I would like to take this opportunity to explain our votes on them.

China has stood consistently for the complete prohibition and total elimination of nuclear weapons. We believe that continued promotion of the nuclear disarmament process is essential for the early elimination of the threats posed by nuclear weapons, improvement in the international security environment and the maintenance of world peace.

China supports the objectives of these draft resolutions because we should promote nuclear disarmament and the early achievement of a world free of nuclear weapons. While the provisions of draft resolutions A/C.1/63/L.14 and L.30 have room for improvement, they are comparatively balanced. Therefore, China voted in favour of them. However, because the measures called for in draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.58 are not feasible in the current circumstances, we abstained in the voting on it.

**Mr. Rao** (India): My delegation requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.30, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

India remains committed to the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. We are concerned about the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use or threat of use. India also shares the view that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing. We continue to believe that the best and most effective non-proliferation would be a credible time-bound programme for global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament.

We voted against the draft resolution because India cannot accept the appeal to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear-weapon State. In urging India to accede to the NPT promptly and without conditions, the draft resolution negates the rules of customary international law as enshrined in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which provides that a State's acceptance of, ratification of or accession to a treaty is based on the principle of free consent.

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

The Committee will now move on to cluster 2. I call on the representative of Indonesia to make a general statement.

**Mr. Adji** (Indonesia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. Under this cluster, the Movement has submitted a draft resolution entitled "Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol", contained in document A/C.1/63/L.25.

There are two technical updates to the draft resolution, in paragraphs 1 and 4. We continue to renew our call to all States to strictly observe the principles and objectives of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. We also call upon States that have not yet done so to withdraw their reservations to the Protocol. We believe that this act will positively contribute to achieving effective progress towards general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. We hope that all Member States will support those draft resolutions upon which action will be taken shortly.

**The Chairperson:** We shall now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.25. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.25, entitled "Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the 11th meeting, on 17 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.25 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.3.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, 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, Cambodia, 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, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, 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, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

None.

*Abstaining:*

Israel, Marshall Islands, United States of America.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.25 was adopted by 160 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Republic of Tanzania advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairperson:** We have thus concluded action on draft resolutions in cluster 2.

The Committee will now turn to draft resolutions under cluster 3, "Outer space (disarmament aspects)". I call on the representative of Cuba, who wishes to make a general statement.

**Mr. Benítez Versón** (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba believes that it is fitting and necessary that we continue to develop international transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space. Concrete measures, such as prior notification, verification and follow-up, would lead to greater transparency and predictability in space activities. At the same time, Cuba believes that the Conference on Disarmament must play the leading role in the negotiation of a multilateral agreement on the prevention of an arms race in outer space in all its aspects.

Our country co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.44/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities", on which this Committee is now taking action. Cuba also co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.4, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", adopted by the Committee last Wednesday. We believe that those two texts are a significant contribution to the efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space.

**The Chairperson:** We shall now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.44/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.44/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities", was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 12th meeting, on 20 October

2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.44/Rev.1, A/C.1/63/CRP.3\*\* and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.1\*, Add.3\*, Add.4, Add.5\*, Add.6, Add.7 and Add.8. In addition, Norway and Iceland have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

*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, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, 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, Lesotho, 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, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, 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, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, 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, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu,

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

*Against:*

United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Israel.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.44/Rev.1 was adopted by 166 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Republic of Tanzania advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairperson:** I give the floor to the representative of the United States of America, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

**Ms. Rocca** (United States of America): Although the United States delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.44/Rev.1, our vote in no way detracts from our long-standing support for voluntary transparency and confidence-building measures for outer space activities. We have repeatedly noted in multilateral forums that some transparency and confidence-building measures, implemented on a voluntary basis, have the potential to enhance satellite safety and reduce uncertainty in an evolving space environment. In that regard, the United States has pursued international cooperation with other spacefaring nations on best practice guidelines to, for example, mitigate orbital debris.

The United States also supports a set of voluntary transparency and confidence-building measures that focus on a pragmatic and incremental approach to space safety and security. However, our support for such best practice guidelines and voluntary transparency and confidence-building measures ends when such efforts are tied to proposals for legally binding space arms control constraints and limitations.

The United States voted no because it believes the draft resolution makes an unacceptable linkage between proposals for voluntary pragmatic transparency and confidence-building measures and the commencement of futile negotiations on unverifiable space arms control agreements. In particular, we note the draft resolution's reference to Russia's and China's draft treaty proposal introduced this year at the

Conference on Disarmament, which the United States opposes. Our critique of their space arms control treaty is contained in document CD/1847.

Despite that disappointment, the United States will seek to continue to pursue opportunities to establish bilateral space security dialogues with Russia, China and other spacefaring nations. We will also continue to support substantive discussions on space transparency and confidence-building measures at the Conference on Disarmament and other appropriate multilateral forums.

**The Chairperson:** The Committee has thus concluded action on the draft resolutions under cluster 3, "Outer space (disarmament aspects)".

We shall now move to cluster 4, "Conventional weapons". I now give the floor to those representatives who wish to make general statements on this cluster.

**Mr. Duncan** (United Kingdom): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms", was introduced by our colleague Ambassador Roberto García Moritán on 21 October 2008. The draft resolution builds on the work already accomplished in the group of 28 experts appointed by the Secretary-General. Today, we will take the important next step by deciding to take forward the discussion on how to ensure regulation of the arms trade in a forum that includes all United Nations Member States.

All United Nations Members have a stake in these discussions. While only a limited number of countries are major arms manufacturers, it is a fact that the majority of countries become suppliers when they dispose of their obsolete or surplus weapons. Many colleagues have spoken more eloquently than I of the human misery caused by the failure to ensure proper regular of this trade. It is indeed remarkable that, while we have developed extensive and complex regulations for weapons of mass destruction in terms of both production capabilities and the weapons themselves, nothing remotely similar exists at the international level for conventional weapons. That situation must not be allowed to continue.

Two years ago, the General Assembly voted overwhelmingly to take action. It is a function of the United Nations that progress has been slow, but progress there has been, with more than 100 countries

giving detailed views to the Secretary-General and the discussion in the United Nations among the 28 experts leading to a better understanding of some of the elements that could form an integral part of an eventual arms trade treaty.

The fact that more than 100 nations have agreed to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\* indicates the level of support and shared ambition that we collectively have in taking this matter forward. Those countries represent the full range of regions, cultures and faiths that the United Nations community comprises.

The position of the United Kingdom and many others on the need for budgetary rigour is well known. That is why, despite the importance and urgency of taking forward work on an arms trade treaty, we have worked closely with the Secretariat and the Office for Disarmament Affairs in drafting this draft resolution.

Specific dates for the meetings of the open-ended working group were identified by the Secretariat and reflected in the text, following the Secretariat's advice that this would be the way to avoid a requirement for additional funding. We were therefore disappointed that document A/C.1/63/L.59 does not reflect in any way that understanding, or even that the Secretariat's intention is to absorb such costs. We trust that the Secretariat will make every effort to do so, in line with the information given to Member States during the course of this negotiation.

When we began this project two years ago, there were those who said it was too ambitious. Throughout, we have kept as our watchword the advice of one of the founding Members of this Organization: "Nothing very much has ever been achieved by those who say it cannot be done". That is a good maxim worth bearing in mind.

**Ms. Grey** (Australia): I requested the floor as a co-author of this year's draft resolution entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms", contained in document A/C.1/63/L.39\*. We welcome the consensus report of the Group of Governmental Experts, including the recommendation to engage in further discussions. In that regard, we are very pleased to be a co-author of the draft resolution, which seeks to establish an open-ended working group in 2009.

I echo and endorse the comments made by the representative of the United Kingdom relating to the negotiation of this draft resolution. My delegation would like to emphasize our expectation, as articulated by the Secretariat throughout the negotiations, that costs associated with this draft resolution for the biennium 2008-2009 will be absorbed.

**Mr. Tarui** (Japan): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms", Japan understands that, as a result of the prior consultations conducted between the Secretariat and Member States, the Secretariat could absorb the additional expenditure for the meetings of the open-ended working group in 2009. Therefore, it is Japan's understanding that no additional expenditure will be incurred in the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

**Mrs. Rodríguez** (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mexico strongly supports draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms". Like other delegations, we regret that, as the Secretariat has informed us, the draft resolution has budgetary implications that could not be absorbed. Mexico therefore requests the Secretariat to make additional efforts to absorb those costs.

**Mr. Perazza** (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms".

Uruguay will vote in favour of the draft resolution. Moreover, as a sponsor, mine is 1 of 114 nations that have given additional momentum to that important document. With that decision, the Uruguayan Government hopes that the draft arms trade treaty — which, we hope, can be negotiated in an open-ended working group that includes all Member States — will enter a decisive phase leading to the adoption of a legally binding instrument, based on the fundamental principles of international law, that would allow us to reduce the human costs of weapons proliferation, prevent unscrupulous arms dealers from taking advantage of the weakest link in the supply chain,

ensure that all arms exporters work under the same standards, and prevent weapons and ammunition from being transferred when there is a risk that they will be used to commit violations of international law, international human rights law and international humanitarian law.

**Mr. Obisakin** (Nigeria): I just want to add that the delegation of Nigeria supports and is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, entitled “Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms”. We believe that no sacrifice would be too great to make in order to have such a draft resolution, which we see as a positive move towards fashioning a universal and legally binding instrument to control and eliminate the illicit trade in and circulation of weapons. We also wish to appeal to those who are still at the station to get on this train.

**The Chairperson:** I now give the floor to the representative of the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts.

**Mr. Thatchaichawalit** (Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts): In submitting this statement on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, the Secretary-General, under rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, sought to advise the Committee of the potential costs of the provisions of the draft resolution. It is the intention of the Secretariat to make every effort to accommodate the full requirements indicated in the statement on the programme budget implications, which can be determined only in the light of the calendar of conferences and meetings for 2009, which is currently under consideration by the General Assembly and which will be subsequently considered at this session when the Assembly considers the consolidated statement on all programme budget implications and revised estimates for the biennium 2008-2009. Following established procedures, that will be brought to the attention of the Fifth Committee.

**The Chairperson:** I give the floor to the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for an explanation of vote before the voting.

**Mr. Ben-Shaban** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): On behalf of Bahrain, Egypt, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen, I should like to

explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, entitled “Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms”.

We participated with keen interest in the debates that took place in the course of the past few days with regard to this draft resolution. The draft resolution continues to include various substantial shortcomings, however, as it ignores the work of the Group of Governmental Experts established in accordance with resolution 61/89. The draft resolution does refer to the complexity of the issues under discussion in the context of evaluating the feasibility and scope of the standards being contemplated. It also states that further consideration of efforts to address the issue at the United Nations should take place on a step-by-step basis.

Nevertheless, the draft resolution has ignored the report (A/63/334) of the Group, as it prejudices the feasibility and scope of the standards for a convention on the matter as well as the principle of consensus. Despite the importance of the issue, the draft resolution refers to the negotiations on standards carried out in workshops at the regional and subregional levels. The draft resolution therefore lacks a specific provision concerning the work to be done by the proposed open-ended working group, hampering the ability to address the scope and feasibility of standards in a constructive and comprehensive manner.

We therefore believe that the obvious haste to achieve a treaty will only lead to a weak text that lacks objectivity, balance and universality and is susceptible to politicization in a way that harms the interests of developing countries. We find it strange that, at a time when there are numerous challenges facing the implementation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and other disarmament instruments, there is an effort to create yet another regime that actually aims at perpetuating the competitiveness of a number of countries that produce weapons, without striking a balance between States that produce conventional weapons and those that import them for self-defence. The treaty would target importing countries, especially if it should allow major exporting countries to unilaterally judge the practices of other countries in certain areas, such as human rights and sustainable development, in a politicized manner lacking balance and justice.



We are fully committed to the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament and believe in the importance of nuclear disarmament in the context of achieving general and complete disarmament. However, any measure aimed at achieving transparency and regulating armaments in a selective manner would not reflect a balanced or comprehensive approach and would undermine the commitment of the international community to general and complete disarmament. That is especially true given the current situation in the Middle East and the imbalance in the area of conventional-weapon capability vis-à-vis Israel, which Western countries continue to provide with every sort of advanced lethal weapon despite its ongoing violations of human rights, its occupation of Arab territories and its possession of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery outside of any international treaty, including the NPT.

It is unfortunate that the sponsors of the draft resolution have ignored our views and various constructive proposals. Abstaining in the voting is therefore the only option left to us in order to highlight the controversial nature of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\* and the lost opportunity to draft a text acceptable to everyone. Therefore we shall abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

**The Chairperson:** We shall now proceed to take action draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.35. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.35, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 15th meeting, on 22 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.35, A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.2 to Add.5 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.8.

*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, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte

d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, 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, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

None.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.35 was adopted by 172 votes to none.*

**The Chairperson:** We shall now consider the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.39\*. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate recorded votes have been requested on paragraphs 3, 4 and 5. I give the floor the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms", was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the 13th meeting, on 21 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.39\*, A/C.1/63/CRP.3\*\* and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.1\*, Add.2, Add.3, Add.4, Add.5\*, Add.6, Add.7 and Add.8. In addition, Guyana has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, the statement submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly on programme budget implications of the draft resolution has been issued as document A/C.1/63/L.59.

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now vote on paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and

Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia.

*Against:*

United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Bahrain, Belarus, China, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen.

*Paragraph 3 was retained by 141 votes to 1, with 19 abstentions.*

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

**The Chairperson:** We will now proceed to vote on paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia,

Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia.

*Against:*

United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Bahrain, China, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen.

*Paragraph 4 was retained by 142 votes to 1, with 18 abstentions.*

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

**The Chairperson:** We will now proceed to vote on paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia,

Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia.

*Against:*

United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Bahrain, Belarus, China, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen.

*Paragraph 5 was retained by 141 votes to 1, with 19 abstentions.*

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

**The Chairperson:** We will now proceed with a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\* as a whole.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina,

Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, 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, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia.

*Against:*

United States of America, Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Bahrain, Belarus, China, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\* was adopted by 145 votes to 2, with 18 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of Rwanda and Sierra Leone advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairperson:** We have thus concluded action on cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

I now call on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions just adopted.

**Ms. Ancidey** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.35, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus". However, I wish to stress that each State must determine when its accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles is in surplus. Moreover, Venezuela believes that the illicit traffic in ammunition is intrinsically linked to the traffic in weapons and that it is an essential part of the problem. For that reason, the marking of ammunition is an important matter that would help to prevent its diversion to criminal activities and the black market. In that respect, Venezuela believes that the Governments of countries in which the main weapons industries operate have a primary responsibility to adopt regulations on the marking of ammunition before export in order to ensure and facilitate tracing.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela reiterates its firm commitment to complete and general disarmament as a fundamental pillar contributing to the promotion of international peace and security and as a manifestation of a goal shared by all Member States.

Our country decided to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms". We believe that it is more effective to strengthen the existing mechanisms for preventing, combating and eliminating the diversion of conventional weapons to illicit activities.

We are convinced of the importance of the instruments already available to the international community, such as 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 the guidelines for conventional arms transfers adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission, which provide a good basis for finding appropriate responses in this field. In that understanding, the negotiation of a legally binding

instrument on marking and tracing would aim at the strengthening of international efforts aimed at addressing this problem on a global scale.

However, our country believes that the establishment of an open-ended working group to consider/ this initiative in a step-by-step and transparent manner would be a positive step. Such an exercise should ensure that the positions and interests of Member States are duly taken into account to achieve the necessary consensus.

**Mr. Wang Qun (China)** (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms". We did so for several reasons.

First, parts of the draft resolution deviate from the findings of the report (A/63/334) of the Group of Governmental Experts published last August. The report was adopted by consensus by all parties, including the main sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*.

Secondly, the practices of some of the main sponsors have set unfavourable precedents. Moreover, the question of whether those practices will undermine the authority and functioning of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole negotiating body for the multilateral arms control regime merits our in-depth consideration. The legacy of these practices is also worthy of our consideration, as are the problems resulting from those practices.

Although China abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, we are still deeply concerned about the regional instability and humanitarian crises resulting from the illicit traffic in conventional arms. China believes that follow-up discussions on the necessary measures to be taken should be conducted in the context of the report of the Group of Governmental Experts so as to regulate the arms trade and prevent the diversion of conventional weapons from legal to illicit channels. Follow-up discussions should adhere to the important principle adopted by the Group of Governmental Experts on the need to build consensus and not prejudice the outcome of discussions.

In conclusion, China is willing to work with all parties concerned and to continue tirelessly to contribute to resolving the issue of the illicit trade in arms.

**Mr. Rao (India)**: I have asked for the floor to explain India's vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.39\*, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms".

India shares the concerns of the international community about the negative effects of the unregulated international arms trade, particularly in view of the dangerous threat posed by the diversion of conventional arms, including small arms and light weapons, from the legal trade into the hands of terrorists and organized crime, as well as for other criminal activities.

The complexity of the issue of conventional arms transfers is recognized in the report (A/63/334) of the Group of Governmental Experts, in which India was represented. However, the draft resolution has departed from some key aspects of the Group's report.

India supports a step-by-step approach that emphasizes consensus-building, not just on elements but on an agreed framework that will lead to legally binding instruments developed in the United Nations that are objective, balanced, non-discriminatory and capable of securing the broadest possible adherence of the main producers, recipients and users of conventional weapons.

The focus of our efforts here in the First Committee cannot be limited to the responsibilities of exporters or importers alone. The discussions in the Group of Governmental Experts raised numerous questions, not least with regard to the technical and political difficulties involved in seeking to establish a single unified instrument to govern all conventional arms transfers. We believe that the sovereign rights, security interests and defence and foreign policy requirements of Member States are of paramount importance.

While India supports further consideration of those issues within the United Nations and will participate actively and constructively in the open-ended working group, we believe that there is a need for greater clarity and specificity in the mandate of the

group. It is for those reasons that India abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

**Mr. Tarar** (Pakistan): I have asked for the floor to explain our votes on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.35, entitled “Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus”, as well as the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.39\*. Allow me also to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.30.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.35, we voted in favour. However, we would like to emphasize that the onus to take the lead in conventional arms control and disarmament is on the major military Powers.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, we appreciate the fact that it has been improved and has a sharper focus on the prevention of illicit trafficking in conventional arms, instead of on State-to-State transfers. Nevertheless, notwithstanding that eventual qualifier, the draft resolution still seeks to predetermine the outcome of the work of the proposed open-ended working group by suggesting that the outcome would be an arms trade treaty. The draft resolution also fails to take into account the recommendation of the Group of Governmental Experts that further consideration of the matter should be on the basis of consensus.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.30, entitled “Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments”, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and voted against retaining paragraph 4. We are disappointed at the selective and discriminatory language of paragraph 4 that calls upon Pakistan to unconditionally accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear-weapon State. We also cannot accept the NPT-related references in the text, due to our known position on the Treaty.

**Mr. Tan** (Singapore): I take the floor to explain our delegation’s vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, entitled “Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms”.

Singapore supports and will continue to support work towards a common international standard for the control of imports, exports and transfers of

conventional arms. Singapore also firmly believes that further consideration of such a common international standard must be conducted on a step-by-step basis in an open and transparent manner. Further deliberations and decision-making must be conducted on the basis of consensus.

On that premise, Singapore supports the establishment of an open-ended working group in 2009, working on the basis of consensus, to discuss the recommendations contained in the report of the Group of Governmental Experts (A/63/334). Singapore also agrees that the open-ended working group could further consider those elements in the report of the Group of Governmental Experts where consensus could be developed for their inclusion in an eventual treaty.

Singapore notes that the draft resolution remains ambiguous in paragraph 5 with specific regard to the phrase “other existing international obligations”. Since the open-ended working group should work on the basis of consensus, Singapore’s position is that the open-ended working group should only consider international obligations that all Member States are party to.

**Mr. Benítez Versón** (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to explain Cuba’s vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, entitled “Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms”. The text addresses a topic that is complex and highly sensitive, given its important political, economic, legal and security implications for States.

The discussions of the Group of Governmental Experts established under resolution 61/89, in which a Cuban expert took part, demonstrated the great complexity of the topic and the diversity of positions held. In fact, the Group of Governmental Experts was unable to reach agreement on the feasibility of a binding legal instrument establishing common international parameters for the export, import and transfer of conventional arms.

Cuba voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\* because it believes that, despite its defects, it takes into account the primary considerations and proposals put forward by the Cuban delegation in the consultations. In particular, we are pleased that the text includes the following elements.

First, it reaffirms the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and international law. Secondly, it explicitly reaffirms the inherent right to self-defence of all States, as stated in Article 51 of the Charter. Thirdly, the conclusions and recommendations of the Group of Governmental Experts established pursuant to resolution 61/89, which Cuba endorses, are in general, although not entirely, reflected in the text.

Fourthly, an open-ended working group is to be established, open to all States on an equal footing, in order to ensure the continuity of the debate on the topic. The draft resolution explicitly states that consideration of the topic will be transparent, open and phased, with a step-by-step approach, which is consistent with Cuba's position that only a process that ensures the genuine and open participation of all States can be universally acceptable, and thus effective. Fifthly, the text specifies that the open-ended working group will focus on the consideration of matters on which consensus can be reached.

Lastly, the adoption of the draft resolution clearly establishes that future consideration of the topic will be conducted within the United Nations, specifically in a subsidiary body of the General Assembly. We thereby reject the possibility of parallel processes outside the multilateral and global context of the United Nations, as, regrettably, has too often happened with respect to other issues.

While we acknowledge the draft resolution's positive balance, we wish to place on record some of the most salient defects that we see in the text.

First, the draft resolution tends to presuppose in several places that the adoption of an international treaty on the arms trade is the only viable and the most effective way to address the complex issues surrounding arms transfers. The outcome of the discussions of the open-ended working group to be established should not be prejudged. The feasibility or non-feasibility of a future treaty should be considered by that working group, and therefore other ways to address the issue must not be rejected prematurely.

Secondly, the draft resolution makes no reference to the necessary full participation of the primary arms-producing and exporting States in any future instrument on the transfer of arms that claims to be truly effective and universally acceptable.

In the thirteenth preambular paragraph, undue emphasis is placed on small arms and light weapons, to the detriment of the attention that should be paid to the illicit trade in other types of conventional weapons, such as advanced conventional weapons.

**Mr. Litavrin** (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We, too, abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, although our country is concerned by the uncontrolled proliferation of weapons and their falling into the hands of terrorists and criminals.

The Group of Governmental Experts to consider the feasibility of an arms trade treaty proposed a rational way to regulate the transfer of weapons. Its conclusions and recommendations provide a good and balanced basis for future consideration of the entire issue of the international arms trade. We believe that the Group's report (A/63/334) opens the way for serious and detailed work on methods to counteract the uncontrolled proliferation and illicit trade in conventional weapons. The experts stress that the problems related to the transfer of conventional weapons must be discussed in a step-by-step and transparent manner to achieve an outcome acceptable to all States on the basis of consensus. With regard to preventing weapons from being diverted from the legal to the illicit trade, the experts drew attention in their report to such closely related issues as unauthorized re-export, illegal brokering, unlicensed weapons production and the supply of weapons to non-State actors. Those issues still need to be addressed.

The report of the Group of Governmental Experts' does not mention the establishment of an open-ended working group. We are not fully convinced that an even broader format will enable us to achieve consensus when that was not possible with the relatively small group of experts representing 28 States. Nevertheless, in the interests of resolving the problem referred to by the experts, we will not object to the establishment of an open-ended working group if its mandate is based on the recommendations of the final report of the Group of Governmental Experts and on the principle of consensus.

We cannot agree to attempts to prejudge the outcome of the working group's work, which other Member States have mentioned. We propose that the group discuss in greater detail and analyse the many unresolved issues regarding the international trade in

conventional weapons, as called for in the experts' report. We were therefore not in a position to support a draft resolution that does not take account of all the considerations and recommendations of the Group of Governmental Experts.

**Ms. Rocca** (United States of America): I take the floor today to explain the United States delegation's votes against paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms", as well as against the draft resolution as a whole.

Let me start by restating the position of the United States on an arms trade treaty. We support the goal of promoting responsibility in arms transfers and reducing the destabilizing trade in illicit arms, but we do not believe that a global arms trade treaty would accomplish that goal. To be effective, any arms trade treaty would require the support of the major arms exporters. We believe that some major arms exporters would refuse to agree to an arms trade treaty that required meaningful and effective conventional-arms-transfers control policies. The only way to convince all major arms exporters to sign on to an arms trade treaty would be to weaken its provisions. Concluding a weak arms trade treaty would legitimize an international standard based on the lowest common denominator that would not address the problem of illicit and irresponsible arms transfers.

Notwithstanding our concerns about an arms trade treaty and our vote against resolution 61/89, my country decided to participate in the Group of Governmental Experts on an arms trade treaty that met this year. The United States expert worked to ensure that the Group's report (A/63/334) accurately conveyed the complex nature of the international arms trade and the need to avoid ineffective and detrimental measures. We were not alone in the Group in insisting that the follow-on work called for by proponents of an arms trade treaty must occur in a step-by-step manner and on the basis of consensus in order to ensure standards that can be implemented and that address the issue constructively.

In the end, all members of the Group of Governmental Experts were able to agree to the carefully balanced recommendation that

"further consideration of efforts within the United Nations to address the international trade in

conventional arms is required on a step-by-step basis in an open and transparent manner to achieve, on the basis of consensus, a balance that will provide benefit to all" (A/63/334, para. 27).

My Government stands by that recommendation and by the Group's report as a whole. Unfortunately, the draft resolution on an arms trade treaty departs from that carefully constructed recommendation by only selectively drawing on it in paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 and by rushing towards the convening of an open-ended working group. Members will barely have had time to read the Group's report and to consider the General Assembly's resolution before having to start to prepare for the open-ended working group in early 2009. We thought that the members of the Group of Governmental Experts had agreed that a pause and time for reflection were called for before starting any follow-on work at the United Nations.

More important, we do not see anywhere in paragraph 3, or for that matter in the rest of the draft resolution, protections to allow States to participate honestly in a process that touches directly on one of the most sensitive and important parts of the Charter of the United Nations, that of the right of individual Members to self-defence. Will States with regional security concerns decide to abrogate their sovereign responsibility to protect their citizens by deciding to participate in a process that could potentially put at risk their ability to defend themselves? The report of the Group of Governmental Experts reflects the fact that discussion repeatedly returned to that concern. For example, paragraph 16 of the report states:

"It was noted that the feasibility of a potential arms trade treaty would be dependent on establishing its collectively agreed objectives, its practical applicability, its resistance to political abuse and its potential for universality."

In its concluding part, paragraph 27 directly states that follow-on work on an arms trade treaty should be done in the United Nations system on the basis of consensus. How are Members to interpret the fact that paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the draft resolution only draw on the language in the conclusion that the sponsors find most appealing, and brush aside words, such as consensus, that are less appealing for some but critical for others? Is that what awaits us in an arms trade treaty process? My delegation certainly hopes not.



The only way to achieve a balanced and effective international mechanism for controlling the trade in conventional arms is to proceed on the basis of consensus. Those are the concerns that led us to call for separate votes on paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, and to vote no on them and on the draft resolution as a whole.

**Ms. Fedorovich** (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): I take the floor to explain my delegation's votes on paragraphs 3 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, as well as on the draft resolution as a whole. We abstained in all those votes.

We are concerned about the negative impact of the uncontrolled proliferation of weapons and about the possibility of their falling into the hands of terrorists and criminals. We welcome the draft resolution's proposal to establish an open-ended working group, which we believe to be the best way to discuss the initiative to establish supply controls in this area. Many Member States could participate in the discussions. The delegation of Belarus is prepared to take an active part in the group's work.

However, we must also point out that both the draft resolution and the report (A/63/334) of the Group of Governmental Experts are selective. We did not participate in the Group's work, and therefore can only base ourselves on its report, which was adopted by consensus.

We are also unclear about the language of paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, which states that the open-ended working group will consider those elements in the report of the Group of Governmental Experts where consensus could be developed. We believe that the mandate of the working group should include holding discussions about the potential parameters and scope of a treaty on the trade in conventional weapons and their interrelationship. The effectiveness, objectivity and non-discriminatory character of the potential parameters predetermine the answer to the question of whether it is appropriate to draft and conclude such a treaty. Taking into account the interests of all potential parties to the treaty from the very beginning of the negotiations could also contribute to its universality and feasibility in the future.

We regret that the draft resolution does not include a direct reference to the fact that the working group should endeavour to adopt its decisions on the basis of consensus.

**Mr. Bolourian** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation with respect to draft resolution A/63/L.39\*, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms".

In view of the complexity of the issues of conventional arms transfers, the Group of Governmental Experts recommends, in paragraph 27 of its report (A/63/334), that further consideration of efforts within the United Nations to address the international trade in conventional arms is required on a step-by-step basis. Notwithstanding that recommendation, the mandate of the open-ended working group to be established in 2009, as stipulated in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, is designed to focus on exploring the common elements for an eventual treaty on the arms trade. In our view, that issue needs further deliberation and it is still premature to rush into a treaty.

Moreover, the comprehensive implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons is considered to be a priority. We are concerned that a premature move towards an arms trade treaty would lead to undermining the effective implementation of the Programme of Action.

Therefore, while we continue to further examine the proposals contained in the draft treaty, at this stage my delegation has abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*.

**Mr. Seruhire** (United Republic of Tanzania): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\*, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms", in recognition of its final preambular paragraph, which includes small arms and light weapons in the category of conventional arms. We did so in the understanding and the hope that, during the sixty-fourth session, the phrase "small arms and light weapons" will be included at the end of operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution.

**Mr. Marrakchi** (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.39\*. We emphasize the high level of participation in the voting and welcome the strong majority that supported the draft

resolution. We also welcome the establishment of an open-ended working group, which, in our view, is an appropriate framework for addressing this complex and universal problem. That underscores the maturity of the idea of an arms trade treaty and confirms the political will of member countries to become part of the process, despite the technical shortcomings that may be detected in the draft resolution and without prejudging the outcome of future efforts and negotiations undertaken within the framework of well-defined principles and guarantees, in particular those reiterated in the text of the draft resolution just adopted by the Committee.

My delegation commends the work done by the authors of the draft resolution and stresses the wide-ranging discussions and inclusive consultations in which it took place. We express our hope that future work will enable us to take account of the concerns and, in particular, the legitimate considerations of those countries that were not in a position to vote in favour of the draft resolution today, given the universal nature of an arms trade treaty.

My delegation also wishes to note the commitment shown by civil society — in particular civil society in my country — in this area. My delegation stresses that, since the beginning of this process within the United Nations, Morocco has taken part in these efforts in an ongoing and constructive manner, inspired mainly by our long-standing commitment to curbing the ravages caused by the illicit, irresponsible and uncontrolled circulation of conventional weapons, in particular small arms and light weapons, on the African continent.

Morocco's commitment is thus based on principled position that is clear, unambiguous and inspired by a genuine feeling of urgency regarding the need for an arms trade treaty to regulate the import, export and transfer of conventional weapons. My delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.39\* reflects and reaffirms our continued commitment, without prejudice to respect for and understanding of the national positions of those countries, particularly Arab countries, that abstained in the voting.

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to consider those draft resolutions in cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

I now call on those representatives wishing to make general statements on this cluster.

**Mr. Adji (Indonesia):** I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). Under this cluster, we have submitted four draft resolutions. The first is draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.20, entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation".

We believe strongly in multilateralism and multilaterally agreed solutions, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, as the only sustainable way to address disarmament and international security issues. We also believe that it is critical that the General Assembly adopt such a draft resolution in order to reflect our continued conviction of the role of the United Nations in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. NAM underscores multilateralism as the core principle in negotiations in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation, with a view to maintaining and strengthening universal norms and enlarging their scope.

Secondly, with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.21, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", NAM considers that the continued sustainability of the global environment is an issue of utmost importance, especially for coming generations. We should collectively endeavour to ensure that necessary measures are taken to preserve and protect the environment, especially in the formulation and implementation of agreements concerning disarmament and arms control. We call upon all Member States to ensure the application of scientific and technological processes in the framework of international security, disarmament and other related fields, without detriment to the environment or to its effective contribution to attaining sustainable development.

Thirdly, with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.23, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", NAM believes that the symbiotic relationship between disarmament and development and the important role of security in this connection cannot be denied. We are concerned at the increasing global military expenditures that could otherwise be allocated to development, poverty eradication and the elimination of diseases, particularly in the developing world.

NAM reiterates the importance of exercising restraint in military expenditure so that the human and financial resources thus saved can be used for the ongoing efforts to eradicate poverty and to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. In this connection, NAM welcomes the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on the relationship between disarmament and development and its reappraisal of this significant issue in the current international context. We consider it important to follow up on the implementation of the action programme adopted at the 1987 International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. In that regard, we invite Member States to provide the Secretary-General with information regarding measures and efforts to devote part of the resources made available by the implementation of disarmament and arms limitation agreements to economic and social development with a view to reducing the ever-widening gap between developed and developing countries.

Fourthly, with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.26, entitled "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium", depleted uranium is a chemically toxic and radioactive compound that is used in armour-piercing munitions because of its very high density. There is yet no clear understanding of the full impact that the fine particles of depleted uranium may have on the human body. The International Atomic Energy Agency, the World Health Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme have all stated that more research is needed with respect to the immediate and/or long-term health or environmental effects of depleted uranium munitions. In this connection, the draft resolution reflects the legitimate concern of the international community about the possible impacts of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium.

Compared to previous resolutions on this subject adopted last year, this draft resolution contains two additional preambular paragraphs and four additional operative paragraphs. In addition to taking note of the opinions expressed by Member States and relevant international organizations on this issue, as reflected in the report (A/63/170 and Add.1) submitted by the Secretary-General pursuant to resolution 62/30, the draft resolution invites Member States and international organizations that have not yet done so to

communicate their views to the Secretary-General with regard to the effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium on human health and the environment.

It also encourages Member States, particularly the affected States, to facilitate studies and research on this issue. The draft resolution further requests the Secretary-General to request relevant international organizations to update and complete their studies and research on the effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium on human health and the environment.

Finally, the draft resolution requests that the Secretary-General submit an updated report in two years' time, at the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

In closing, the Non-Aligned Movement hopes that all delegations will be able to join us in supporting the four draft resolutions on which action will be taken very shortly.

**Mr. Benítez Versón** (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I will try to be as brief as I can.

First, we would like to fully endorse the statement made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). As the representative of Indonesia said with respect to cluster 6, the 118 members of NAM have submitted four draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/63/L.20, A/C.1/63/L.21, A/C.1/63/L.23 and A/C.1/63/L.26. We believe that these draft resolutions address various important matters that are highly relevant not just to members of NAM, but also to the international community as a whole.

The complex international situation and the need to jointly address the pressing problems that humanity faces attest, in our opinion, to the importance of A/C.1/63/L.20, entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation". We believe that this text is a contribution to the discussions on and efforts to find lasting and effective multilateral solutions in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation.

As affirmed in draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.21, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", the pertinent environmental norms should be borne fully in mind

when negotiating disarmament and arms controls instruments. Many delegations have sent information on this matter to the Secretary-General, which, in our opinion, reflects the great importance they attach to it.

Finally, let me now refer to A/C.1/63/L.26, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”. The draft resolution, which was adopted by the General Assembly for the first time last year with the support of the broad majority of States, addresses a matter of the legitimate concern of the international community. Numerous countries and organizations have expressed their concerns regarding the possible effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium. Preliminary studies undertaken by bodies such as the United Nations Environment Programme, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the World Health Organization have concluded that research must continue to determine the long-term effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium. The primary objective of A/C.1/63/L.26 is to facilitate the continuity of such research and studies.

Cuba therefore urges all delegations to support these four draft resolutions. We are sure that they will receive the positive votes of the great majority of delegations, as has been the case in previous years.

**The Chairperson:** We shall now take action on draft resolutions under cluster 6.

We shall first take action the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.20. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.20, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 15th meeting, on 22 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.20 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.3. In addition, Uruguay has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize,

Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.20 was adopted by 115 votes to 5, with 49 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson:** We will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.21. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.21, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 15th meeting, on 22 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.21 and in A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.4.

**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.21 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** We will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.23. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.23, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 15th meeting, on 22 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.23 and in A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.3. In addition, Uruguay 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.

I call on the representative of France for a point of order.

**Mr. Danon** (*spoke in French*): My delegation requests a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.23.

**The Chairperson:** The representative of France has requested a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.23.

*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, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, 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:*

France.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.23 was adopted by 167 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

**The Chairperson:** We will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.26. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.26, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 15th meeting, on 22 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.26 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.1\*.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan,

Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.26 was adopted by 127 votes to 4, with 34 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson:** I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make explanations of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

**Mr. Tarui** (Japan): I would like to explain why Japan voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.26, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”.

On the basis of last year’s draft resolution, Japan has submitted to the Secretary-General its views on the issue of depleted uranium ammunitions. Studies into the effects on human health and the environment of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium have been or are in the process of being carried out by the relevant international organizations. Nevertheless, we recognize that, at present, no internationally definitive conclusions have been drawn from those investigations. We will continue to closely follow developments in the studies being conducted by the relevant organizations.

In that connection, Japan commends the international organizations, including the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the United Nations Environment Programme, that have carried out all the studies and activities related to ammunitions containing depleted uranium. We also wish to express our appreciation to

the IAEA and WHO for submitting their views to the current Secretary-General.

Japan would like to call upon all relevant international organizations to continue their on-site studies as well as to undertake further information collection and to submit their views, as appropriate, on the effects that the use of depleted uranium munitions may have on the human body and the environment.

**Ms. Grey** (Australia): I have taken the floor on behalf of Australia, Canada and New Zealand to explain our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.20, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”.

We are disappointed that, once again, we were unable to support this draft resolution. Our strong commitment to multilateral principles and approaches in the field of non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament is well known, and we have consistently advocated the benefit of multilateral processes in achieving progress on international security issues. However, we cannot agree that multilateralism constitutes the core principle in negotiations on disarmament and non-proliferation, as implied in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution.

In our view, effective progress on global non-proliferation and disarmament objectives requires a combination of multilateral, plurilateral, regional, bilateral and unilateral measures working to reinforce one another in order to achieve concrete results. The eighth preambular paragraph specifically recognizes the complementarity of such measures. We hope that, in the future, the operative paragraphs of this draft resolution will reflect that understanding.

In our view, the assertion that multilateralism provides the only sustainable method of addressing non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament issues disregards the potential of alternative measures, such as bilateral and regional measures, to address global security issues. We cannot afford not to make use of all measures available to us to improve the international security environment.

Those are the reasons why we were unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.20 and instead abstained in the voting on it.

**Mr. Danon** (France) (*spoke in French*): I am speaking in my national capacity on draft resolution

A/C.1/63/L.23, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”.

Over the past few years, the international community has highlighted the importance of the link between disarmament issues and development issues. My delegation does not dispute that link. We fully acknowledge it, because the creation of a stable and secure environment that depends on disarmament in areas emerging from armed conflict is a prerequisite for the success of any reconstruction and development policy. We also do not dispute the challenge of development financing, as shown by our initiatives on that issue in recent years.

Nevertheless, we continue to abstain in the voting on this text because of various elements contained in the language to which we cannot subscribe. This year once again, suggested amendments were proposed to the authors of the draft resolution. Regrettably, even the most minor of our suggestions was not taken into account.

We dispute the notion of a symbiotic relationship between disarmament and development, mentioned in the seventh preambular paragraph. Disarmament obviously has an impact on development conditions, but the reverse is much more debatable.

The idea, expressed in the same paragraph, that resources devoted to military expenditure “could otherwise be spent on development needs” seems rather reductive to us. Not only does disarmament have a cost that must also be taken into account, but defence investments, if they are aimed at acquiring means that will help to strengthen stability and improve States’ capacities to contribute to peacekeeping operations and their response to natural disaster situations — as is the case, for example, with the acquisition of air and sea military transport capacities — cannot be considered expenditure diverted from development. Instead, the contrary is true.

Finally, there are a number of initiatives aimed at developing innovative development financing mechanisms that will, as a result of the strict allocation of existing resources, put the thrust of this text into perspective. Those elements did not permit us to vote in favour of this text, and we regret that.

**Ms. Paterson** (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom would like to comment on three draft

resolutions: A/C.1/63/L.23, A/C.1/63/L.21 and A/C.1/63/L.30.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.23, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", the United Kingdom is pleased to have been able to support it. We welcome the mainstreaming of disarmament issues in development policy. That is particularly important in the fields of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons, and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration.

The United Kingdom does not believe that there is an automatic link between disarmament and development. Rather, a complex relationship exists between the two. Unfortunately, this draft resolution does not fully explain the complexity of that relationship. As we said last year, we also had some reservations about the report of the Group of Governmental Experts. For example, we believe that the report does not give sufficient credit to unilateral, bilateral and multilateral actions in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation.

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

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.21, had there been a call for a vote, the United Kingdom probably would have abstained. On this occasion, since there was no call for a vote, we would like to indicate that we did not participate in the adoption.

**Mr. Landman** (Netherlands): This year, the Netherlands has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.26, entitled "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium".

The Netherlands is not against ongoing research on this subject and appreciates its being discussed in the forum of the United Nations. However, we do feel that the basis for such research and discussions could have been formulated at this stage in a more neutral way by speaking of possible consequences instead of potential harmful effects.

Nevertheless, we feel that the references in this year's draft resolution to the report of the Secretary-General (A/63/170 and Add.1) on this subject sufficiently allow Member States and other organizations to take into consideration the views, including that of my Government, that state that to date the reference in the draft resolution to the potential harmful effects of the use of depleted uranium ammunitions on human health and the environment cannot be supported by conclusive scientific evidence. That view is shared by the World Health Organization and the International Atomic Energy Agency in the same report.

We will closely monitor the outcome of ongoing and future research in this field and take any further developments into consideration when this issue is taken up again during the 2010 session of the First Committee.

**Ms. Rocca** (United States of America): I am taking the floor to explain our position on draft resolutions A/C.1/63/L.21, A/C.1/63/L.23 and A/C.1/63/L.26.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.21, the United States disassociates itself from the Committee's action. The United States operates under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including its implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. However, it sees no direct connection between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.23, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", the United States did not participate in the Committee's action. Our delegation continues to believe that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that do not lend themselves to being linked. It was for that reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 conference on this matter. Accordingly, the United States does not and will not consider itself bound by the final document of that conference.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.26, I am speaking on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom and France. Our three countries voted no on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L. 26, entitled "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium".



This is not a new issue. The draft resolution calls for further action by the Secretary-General and United Nations Member States, based on the potential harmful effects of the use of depleted uranium munitions on human health and the environment. By doing so, it ignores an already significant and growing body of scientific evidence on this subject. The environmental and long-term health effects of the use of depleted uranium munitions have been investigated by the World Health Organization, the United Nations Environment Programme, the International Atomic Energy Agency, NATO, the Centers for Disease Control, the European Commission and others. None of those inquiries has been able to document long-term environmental or health effects attributable to the use of these munitions. It is regrettable that a United Nations report should be ignored.

**Mr. Danon** (France) (*spoke in French*): I should like to briefly clarify our position on two votes.

We voted against draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.30 and abstained in the separate voting on paragraph 4 of that draft resolution. We did so because, when we vote against a draft resolution, for consistency's sake it is our practice to abstain in the voting on separate paragraphs. We did not do so because of the contents of that paragraph. I would like that to be clear.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.21, as there was no voting on that draft resolution, like the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom we would like to clarify that we wish to be considered as not having participated in that decision.

**The Chairperson:** We have thus concluded action on cluster 6.

We now turn to cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". I call on those representatives who wish to make general statements on this cluster.

**Mr. Paudel** (Nepal): My delegation has asked to take the floor to speak on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.42, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", introduced by my delegation before this Committee at the 17th meeting, on 24 October 2008.

My delegation firmly believes that the Regional Centre is a primary entity established by the General Assembly to promote recent best initiatives and dialogues towards peace, disarmament and

non-proliferation. It is an appropriate mechanism that understands the sensitivities, urgencies and needs of the Member States in the region. That is why my delegation believes in enhancing the Centre's activities to build confidence and ensure the gradual improvement of transparency in the region.

As a sponsor of the draft resolution, we are confident that the preambular and operative paragraphs of the draft resolution duly reflect the context of the Centre's relocation from New York to Kathmandu and the essential content of the Secretary-General's report (A/63/178) on the matter. My delegation firmly believes that unless we ensure stable funding to sustain the core activities of the Centre in its mandated area, our lofty goals for disarmament and non-proliferation will remain only a distant dream.

In this light, while appealing to Member States for voluntary contributions in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide support from the biennial regular budget starting in 2010-2011. Let us work together to transform our sublime goals of peace, disarmament and non-proliferation from rhetoric into reality. An effective and efficient Regional Centre will be the final step towards that transformation.

As in previous years, we and the other sponsors would like to request that the Committee adopt draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.42 without a vote.

**Mr. Adji** (Indonesia): I have the honour to make this general statement on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) on draft resolutions under cluster 7.

During the present session of the First Committee, many delegations have reaffirmed the validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. They have expressed their determination to promote multilateralism as an essential way to develop arms regulation and disarmament negotiations. In the Final Document adopted by consensus at the conclusion of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, whose thirtieth anniversary we commemorate this year, we stated, *inter alia*, that while the final objective of the efforts of all States should continue to be general and complete disarmament under effective international controls, the immediate goal is to eliminate the danger posed by nuclear weapons.

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

NAM continues to see the need to work towards the convening of the fourth special session and reaffirms its strong support to that end, taking into account the constructive dialogue and active engagement among Member States, including key delegations, during the 2007 substantive session of the Open-ended Working Group. In that regard, we hope that delegations can support the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/63/L.22, requesting the inclusion in the provisional agenda of the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly the item entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

Under this cluster, NAM is also submitting draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.24, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament". NAM underlines that the United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament have been instrumental in promoting understanding and cooperation among States and their respective regions in the fields of peace, disarmament and development. The General Assembly continues its appeal to all Member States, as well as to international governmental and non-governmental organizations and foundations, to make voluntary contributions to the centres with a view to the strengthening, facilitation and implementation of their programmes and activities.

NAM hopes that all delegations will be able to join us in supporting the aforementioned draft decision and resolution.

In addition, I should like to make a general statement on draft resolutions A/C.1/63/L.13, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean", and A/C.1/63/L.42, entitled "United

Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific".

NAM would like to stress the important role that the regional centres can play in promoting confidence-building, peace and disarmament measures at the regional level. That promotes progress in achieving the goals of sustainable development. To invest in the regional centres is to invest in peace and in regional and international security.

As with our support for draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.50/Rev.1, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa" and adopted yesterday, the Group of Non-Aligned Countries, in view of the many challenges faced by the regions of Asia and the Pacific and Latin America and the Caribbean in the security and development fields, would like to express its support for the efforts of States in both regions to ensure the necessary operations and functioning of the United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament in their respective regions.

NAM also notes that the Secretary-General has indicated that both regional centres urgently need more core funding for their staffing and operations in order to maintain their ability to fulfil their mandates, including responding to the diverse and numerous requests from States in their respective regions. Therefore, NAM expresses its strong support for draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.13, submitted by Peru, and draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.42, submitted by Nepal, which aim to ensure the predictable cooperation and functioning of the regional centres in support of Latin America and the Caribbean and the Asia-Pacific region.

**Mr. Chávez Basagoitia** (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): I wish to inform the Committee about a technical correction to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.13, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean" and submitted by Peru on behalf of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean.

Paragraph 8 of the draft resolution should include the phrase "in all the countries of the region". Thus, the paragraph should read as follows:

(*spoke in English*)

"Encourages the Regional Centre to further develop activities in all the countries of the

region in the important area of disarmament and development”.

*(spoke in Spanish)*

We hope that, as in previous years, this draft resolution will be adopted without a vote.

**Ms. Rocca** (United States of America): I have taken the floor on behalf of the United States and the United Kingdom. Both our nations support the efforts of nations to work among themselves to solve regional problems, and we believe that the United Nations regional centres can facilitate such work. However, funding for the centres should come from voluntary regional contributions, as it has since they were created.

Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.13, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, and draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.42, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific”, request the Secretary-General to provide, from the biennial regular budget starting in 2010-2011, the necessary support to ensure the sustainability of the core activities and operations of each centre.

While we have traditionally joined the consensus regarding the draft resolutions on these centres, we will not be participating in the adoption of the draft resolutions this year. We are dissociating ourselves from the consensus because the draft resolutions fundamentally change the nature of the centres by including funding from the regular budget. We are opposed to that in general, but especially at a time when it is being proposed that the current regular budget be increased by more than 25 per cent.

**Mr. Danon** (France) *(spoke in French)*: I have taken the floor to indicate to the Committee that my delegation will not take part in the decisions on draft resolutions A/C.1/63/L.13 and A/C.1/63/L.42. We are doing so because, in our view, paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.13 and paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.42 provide for the allocation of resources from the regular budget to activities that are not precisely defined or for allocations that are not precisely defined. That poses a problem for us.

**The Chairperson**: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution

A/C.1/63/L.13. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.13, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean”, was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 17th meeting, on 24 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/63/L.13.

The representative of Peru has introduced an oral revision to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.13, by which the words “in all the countries of the region” would be inserted into paragraph 8 immediately following the word “activities”.

With your permission, Sir, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.13.

Under the terms of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.13, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide, from the biennial regular budget starting in 2010-2011, the necessary support to ensure the sustainability of the core activities and operations of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, in order for it to carry out its programme of activities in accordance with its mandate.

It is recalled that currently the P-5 post of the Director of the Regional Centre is provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. Implementation of the provisions of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution would result in financial implications under the same section of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

In that regard, the modality of support to ensure the sustainability of the core activities and operations of the Regional Centre would be determined and any relevant resource requirements would be considered within the context of the proposed programme budget for 2010-2011.

Accordingly, should the assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.13, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

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

**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 proceed accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.13, as orally revised, was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/63/L.22. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/63/L.22, entitled “Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 16th meeting, on 23 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/63/L.22.

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

*Draft decision A/C.1/63/L.22 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.24. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/63/L.24, entitled “United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 16th meeting, on 23 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in documents A/C.1/63/L.24 and in A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.3.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the

Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.24.

Under the terms of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.24, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide all necessary support, within existing resources, to the regional centres in carrying out their programmes of activities.

The implementation of the request would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. The provision contained therein covers the three P-5 posts of directors of these regional centres for peace and disarmament, one P-3 post and two local-level posts and general operating expenses for the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa. The programmes of activities of the three centres would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.24, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

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

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

**The Chairperson:** The sponsor has expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.24 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.42. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/63/L.42, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific”, was introduced by the representative of Nepal at the 17th meeting, on 24 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.42 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.1\*, Add.3, 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 regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.42.

Under the terms of paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.42, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide, from the biennial regular budget starting in 2010-2011, the necessary support to ensure the sustainability of the core activities and operations of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific, in order for it to carry out its programme of activities in accordance with its mandate. Under the terms of paragraph 6, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to provide the necessary support to the Regional Centre for better achievements and results, within existing resources, until the regular budget is approved.

It is recalled that currently the P-5 post of the Director of the Regional Centre is provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. Implementation of the provisions of paragraph 5 of the draft resolution would result in financial implications under the same section of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011. In this regard, the modality of support to ensure the sustainability of the core activities and operations of the Centre would be determined and any relevant resource requirements would be considered within the context of the proposed programme budget for 2010-2011.

As concerns operative paragraph 6, the implementation of the request would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009, as mentioned in paragraph 3. The programme activities of the Centre would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution

A/C.1/63/L.42, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

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

**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 shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.42 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** I call on the representative of Canada, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions just adopted.

**Mr. Grinius** (Canada): Canada joined the consensus on draft resolutions A/C.1/63/L.13, A/C.1/63/L.42 and A/C.1/63/L.50 regarding the Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific, and the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa because we are supportive of much of the work that the Centres carry out.

Canada has supported the Centres through the provision of personnel and funding for various capacity-building projects. However, Canada remains concerned by the procedural steps followed to provide core funding from the regular budget for the Centres. The three Centres were established on the basis that they obtain voluntary funding, as stated clearly in their terms of reference. It is therefore inappropriate for the First Committee to have made recommendations on allocations of regular budget resources. That is properly the role of the Fifth Committee, as is set out plainly in several resolutions, including General Assembly resolution 45/248 B. The Fifth Committee is where the full range of budgetary considerations can be taken into account. In this context, we note the Secretary-General’s oral reports, as transmitted by the Secretariat.

Canada is disappointed that, at a time when the Secretary-General himself is highlighting the need for budget discipline, the First Committee has decided to adopt a draft resolution inconsistent with the rules governing programme planning and budgeting. We continue to urge the Secretary-General and, indeed, the staff of all United Nations departments to implement a greater focus on strategic planning and resourcing across the entire Organization. The Organization will thus be able to weather the economic difficulties that are currently being experienced on a global basis.

Canada looks forward to the opportunity to review the work plans of the Centres in the context of the next proposed biennial budget. We will work with our partners in these regions to ensure that the Centres are fulfilling their mandates and are actually contributing to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and that they do so in an efficient and effective manner.

**The Chairperson:** The First Committee has taken action on all draft resolutions under this cluster, and has thus concluded the third stage of its work, namely, action on all draft resolutions submitted under disarmament and international security agenda items.

## Agenda item 110

### Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to refer delegations to document A/63/250, specifically paragraph 69 (h), according to which the General Assembly decided to allocate item 110 to all the Main Committees for the sole purpose of considering and taking action on their respective tentative programme of work.

Yesterday, a draft proposed programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2009 was circulated to all delegations in the annex to document A/C.1/63/CRP.5.

I recall that the draft programme was prepared following consultations with the Chairman of the Special Political and Decolonization (Fourth) Committee. It has been agreed that both the First and the Fourth Committees will begin their work in the first week of October, as they have always done, and that they will work in a sequential manner, as in past sessions. The total number of meetings remains the same during the session. However, the allocation of the

meetings to the three segments has been slightly adjusted — based on the experience of the two previous sessions, as I mentioned yesterday, in which the number of speakers in the general debate fell and the number of speakers in the thematic debates rose — with a view to facilitating the interactive process of the thematic debate and by having an additional meeting in the thematic segment of the session.

As representatives know from experience, this draft programme is provisional. It will be adopted and issued in final form before the Committee starts its substantive work at the next session.

**Mr. Grinius** (Canada): Mr. Chairperson, I notice that, yet again, the proposed programme of work goes into a fifth week, including Monday, 2 November, and Tuesday, 3 November — much the same sort of schedule that we had during this particular session. I note, however, that we actually are finishing two and a half days earlier in this session than was originally scheduled. When one considers, in the context of trying to reform the First Committee, the attempt to instil the type of discipline that you, Mr. Chairperson, have so successfully done, I would suggest that, even as a proposed timetable, we might finish the previous Friday, 30 October, so that we can again focus ourselves, as we have this time, and have the incentive to finish within the four-week schedule.

Again, it is a question of more biennial and triennial draft resolutions, which can actually shorten our work schedule. I would also note that this year, in the context of the general debate, there were quite a few instances in which we finished half an hour or 45 minutes earlier than the 6 p.m. deadline.

So again, I would just hope that we can even further tighten and focus our programme of work for next year.

**Ms. Paterson** (United Kingdom): We would like to echo the comments made by the representative of Canada. We have been impressed with the way in which the Committee has been chaired, Mr. Chairperson. We have been able to conduct business fairly quickly with regard to the voting, and you have been quite keen to ensure that we stayed within our time limits in making statements. We also like the idea of according greater attention to thematic debate and interactivity. I think it is rather encouraging. So if we could possibly look at shortening the session to four weeks and focusing more on interactive debate, that would be helpful.

**Ms. Rocca** (United States of America): I just want to express support for the two previous suggestions.

**The Chairperson:** I really appreciate those comments. I have tried to do my best within the available time frame and resources for the benefit of members, and to be as efficient as possible in view of our workload. It is other members who have succeeded; all I have done is to make proposals in Geneva and to follow our programme of work.

I do not want to hinder the incoming Chairperson of the Committee. May I request that, when the Committee adopts documents during the next session, members themselves, as a matter of self-discipline, make the most efficient use of their time in carrying out the Committee's programme of work. I very much appreciate the comments made in that regard during this session. On the other hand, however, I do not want to place restrictions on the new Chairperson.

At the end of the day, I have just made suggestions, and members have done their utmost to assist me. I truly appreciate that, but let me put it this way — it will be in the hands of the new Chairperson, and the new Chairperson will be in the hands of the Committee's members. As I said, this is a draft programme of work, and if members adopt it, they can draw on the experience of this session during the next. By doing so, they would honour me, and I would appreciate it.

If there are no objections, may I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft programme of work and timetable for its next session, as contained in document A/C.1/63/CRP.5?

*It was so decided.*

#### **Statement by the Chairperson**

**The Chairperson:** If I might beg the indulgence of members, in the last few moments I have remaining to me as Chairperson, I should like to make some final comments.

Very simply, I wish to express to the members of the Committee my heartfelt gratitude for their cooperation, assistance, advice, friendship and, above all, understanding during my tenure as Chairperson. I would not have been able to carry out my functions without their assistance. Here, I should like to pay tribute to Miguel Graça of Portugal, Ivan Mutavdžić of Croatia, Martin Zvachula of Micronesia and our

Rapporteur, Coly Seck of Senegal, all of whom have been most helpful to me, providing support and dealing with situations when I have been unable to do so. To them, I express my heartfelt gratitude. I will always remember them.

Furthermore, in addressing substantive issues, I have constantly relied on Mr. Sergio Duarte, High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, drawing on his advice, knowledge and institutional memory with regard to the workings of the Committee. I express my deepest gratitude to him and all his staff, who have been most helpful to me in guiding our work.

Moreover, I should like to express my gratitude to the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management through its representatives Jarmo Sareva, who has been with me since the beginning, and Timur Alasaniya, as well as to all staff of the Secretariat working in this room. In addition, there are two people who have been moving among members, asking questions and distributing documents. I wish to pay tribute to those people, Augusto Rabellino and Troy Venechanos, who have been providing the Committee with information. My thanks go also to the Conference Officers, who have been distributing documents and clearing desks after meetings — Emma Pioche, Evens Delbrune, Isabelle McKusick, Lindsay O'Hara and Jessup Meng — as well as the voting technicians who have been assisting us, the sound technicians and the interpreters, without whom we could not communicate. Finally, the Committee is entitled to verbatim records, and in the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management there are men and women who create the official records of every word spoken in the Committee. That is very hard work, and I thank them for it.

I ask members to give all these people a round of applause.

**Mr. Adji** (Indonesia): I have taken the floor on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. We would like to express our appreciation and commendation to you, Mr. Chairperson, and the other members of the Bureau for your tireless efforts in guiding the work of the Committee throughout the present session. Our appreciation goes also to the members of the Secretariat for their dedication to their work. We hope that all of the draft resolutions and draft decisions that have been adopted can be duly implemented in order to achieve the better world to which we aspire.

**Mr. Obisakin** (Nigeria): In Nigeria, we have a proverb, and I would like to share it with the Committee. In the tropics, where the weather is usually warm, there are many lizards. One of the most famous lizards is the *Agama agama*. That is the taxonomic name. It is very colourful. The head is red or pink; the female's is green. It likes to climb very tall trees. I see someone has an image of one, so it is universal. Thank God that lizards are universal too.

That lizard likes to climb very tall trees. One of the tallest trees in my country is called the iroko, which is a hardwood tree that grows as high as 100 feet. When the lizard jumps down from the high iroko tree, it nods. We believe that the lizard is saying, "Well, if nobody praises me, I will at least praise myself". I think, Mr. Chairperson, that your lizard has climbed the tall iroko tree and has come down swiftly, not jumping, falling or feeling dizzy. On behalf of Africa, we very grateful to you, Sir.

*(spoke in French)*

You have done a fine job. Your lizard has climbed the tree and reached the ground without knocking himself out. We are very grateful to you.

*(spoke in English)*

We also want to tell you that there is no doubt that there may have been occasions when we have had minor brushes. They were not intentional. We are all defending the interests of humankind. I want to end by recalling a proverb: If you are lucky and have a set of 32 teeth, the tongue and the teeth are together forever in the same chamber. Once in a while they quarrel, but it is never intentional. Thank you and God bless.

**The Chairperson:** Thank God that the laugh is between the teeth and the tongue.

**Mr. Danon** (France) *(spoke in French)*: Very briefly, in my capacity as the representative of the presidency of the European Union, I too would like to express my gratitude to you, Mr. Chairperson, as well as to the entire Secretariat team, including the interpreters, note-takers and all who contribute to making our work possible.

**Mr. Guimarães** (Brazil): As Brazil will assume the chairmanship of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Group this month, I should like to say, Mr. Chairman, that your competency is very well known in the United Nations from the previous duties you have had. However, you also represent the Latin American and Caribbean Group, and we are very pleased to say that you represented our regional Group very well.

**The Chairperson:** I appreciate that comment. It is true that my dear friends in Honduras proposed my candidacy for this post. However, I must also acknowledge the support I received from Latin America. I would like to express my gratitude to all my friends in the Committee, who have been at my side all along.

At this point, we have concluded the main part of the 2008 session of the First Committee. I wish all representatives a very happy Halloween. I hope they get their rest this weekend. As I said earlier, the Committee will reconvene some time in May or June next year to elect the Chairperson for the sixty-fourth session. I am very grateful to everyone.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*