



General Assembly

Sixty-first session

First Committee

23rd meeting

Monday, 30 October 2006, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chairperson: Mrs. Juul (Norway)

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

Agenda items 82 to 97 (*continued*)

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

The Chairperson: This afternoon, the Committee will continue to take action on the remaining draft resolutions that appear in informal working paper no. 4, starting with those under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons". After completing action on draft resolutions under cluster 1, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons", followed by draft resolutions under clusters 5, 6 and 7.

The Committee will now proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions under cluster 1 in informal working paper no. 4. I first call upon those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on draft resolutions under cluster 1.

Mr. Macedo (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I am speaking in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

Mexico, as a founding member of the first nuclear-weapon-free zone, which is in a very densely populated area of the world, reiterates its congratulations to and its solidarity with the five countries that decided to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia through the Semipalatinsk Treaty. In the northern hemisphere, that effort joins the effort of Mongolia, which has been declared a nuclear-

weapon-free territory. The importance of the Semipalatinsk Treaty cannot be denied. We hope that it will be followed by similar initiatives, particularly in the northern hemisphere.

Our experience in Latin America and the Caribbean has thus made us fully aware that building a nuclear-weapon-free zone takes time and requires the commitment of all the nuclear Powers and the support of the international community. In that connection, we hope that the remaining obstacles can be gradually overcome.

Mexico encourages the Governments of Central Asia to continue their efforts and expresses its readiness to work together to promote better cooperation and coordination among the nuclear-weapon-free zones. For Mexico, such zones represent not an end in themselves, but a means to attain the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament. That is why my delegation will support the draft resolution entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia".

Mr. Toledo (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia", which welcomes the signing of the Semipalatinsk Treaty on 8 September 2006. More than 40 years have passed since the signing of the treaty establishing the world's first nuclear-weapon-free zone, in Latin America. Moreover, it is important to recall that the creation of that zone in the 1960s took place in

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.



a very difficult period in our history. With political will, it was possible to make it a reality through the efforts of all interested parties.

The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, freely entered into, reflects the right of any independent State to determine the best living conditions for its population. Therefore, not to support this draft resolution would be not to recognize the right of every State to determine its own way to live in harmony with the international community. That is why my country's delegation appeals to countries harbouring any doubts to support this draft resolution, in the conviction that every State has the sovereign right and power to negotiate as needed in order to establish peace and security in its region.

Thus, for those reasons, my country's delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution.

Mr. Apolinar Espinal (Dominican Republic) (*spoke in Spanish*): First, we should like to congratulate you, Madam, on your excellent work in guiding the work of the First Committee. We have taken the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia".

The Dominican Republic, as a country that is committed to international peace and security and that believes that disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are essential elements in achieving those goals, values the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone by the countries of Central Asia. We consider this to be a resolute and important step towards the objective of complete nuclear disarmament. As a State party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which established the first nuclear-weapon-free zone, in Latin America and the Caribbean, we encourage other countries to follow the example of Central Asia. For that reason, we will vote in favour of this draft resolution.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

The Republic of Venezuela supports efforts to strengthen international peace and security that have as a priority the total elimination of nuclear weapons as well as their non-proliferation. We believe that one of the most effective ways to achieve those objectives is the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of agreements freely entered into among States.

For that reason, our country is a party to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean — the Treaty of Tlatelolco — an instrument that established the first nuclear-weapon-free zone in an inhabited region of the world. In that context, we congratulate Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan on the signing, last September in Semipalatinsk, of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia, the first such zone in the northern hemisphere. We wish to express our support for draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, which was submitted by those five Central Asian countries.

Venezuela believes that that initiative will significantly contribute to efforts to achieve the goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons and of nuclear non-proliferation. At the same time, we would like to underline the need for nuclear-weapon States to provide to all States in nuclear-weapon-free zones unconditional guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia", because our country fully supports the signing of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia and views it as a positive step towards achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament.

At the Havana Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement in September, the heads of State and Government of the countries of the Movement welcomed with satisfaction the signing of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia at Semipalatinsk on 8 September 2006 by Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan and considered the establishment of the zone as an effective contribution to the strengthening of regional and international peace and security.

The Summit also reiterated the fact that it is vital, in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, that nuclear-weapon States provide all States in the zone with unconditional guarantees against the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Cuba welcomes the willingness expressed by the signatories to the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia to continue consultations with nuclear-weapon States on certain provisions of that

legal instrument. We hope that the nuclear-weapon States will participate in good faith in that consultation process, so that the zone can be established as soon as possible.

The Chairperson: Are there any other delegations wishing to explain their vote before the voting? If not, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.21/Rev.1, entitled “2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee”.

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.1/61/L.21/Rev.1, entitled “2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee”, was introduced by the representative of Brazil at the 10th meeting, held on 10 October 2006. The sponsor of the draft is indicated in the document.

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.1/61/L.21/Rev.1.

“Under the terms of operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.21/Rev.1, the General Assembly would:

‘[Take] note of the decision of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, following appropriate consultations, to hold the first session of the Preparatory Committee in Vienna from 30 April to 11 May 2007’; and

‘[Request] the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee’.

“Pursuant to the request contained in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, it is the understanding of the Secretary-General that Secretariat assistance and substantive support services to the 2010 Review Conference and its

Preparatory Committee would be required for its implementation.

“Conference-servicing costs of the first session of the Preparatory Committee in Vienna, including the provision of summary records for five plenary meetings, are estimated at \$704,835. In addition, non-conference-servicing requirements for travel of substantive staff from the Department for Disarmament Affairs, general temporary assistance, overtime, communications and miscellaneous expenses are estimated at \$34,200.

“In accordance with established procedures, the United Nations would levy a charge at a rate of 13 per cent of expenditures for such activities, to defray the administrative and other support costs incurred in their implementation. Such expenses are estimated at \$96,075. Furthermore, in accordance with established policies and procedures in the United Nations, a provision corresponding to 15 per cent of the estimated costs of the meeting would have to be made for a contingency reserve to cover eventual shortfalls and final expenditures. This would amount to \$110,855.

“In order to ensure that the convening of the session in Vienna would not result in additional costs for the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Government of Austria has indicated its readiness to cover the additional costs of holding the meeting in Vienna, instead of New York, which are estimated at approximately \$56,816.

“A decision on the dates and venues for holding further sessions of the Preparatory Committee and on the Review Conference is expected to be finalized by the parties at the first session of the Preparatory Committee, together with a number of other decisions on organizational arrangements, including the provision of five summary records.

“All costs related to the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee shall be met in accordance with the arrangements made by the parties to the Treaty. The request that the Secretary-General render the necessary assistance

and provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the 2010 Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee, should thus have no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations. Following the established practice, the Secretariat will prepare cost estimates for the 2010 Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee for the approval of the States parties.

“It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties, under their respective legal instruments, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations. These activities would be undertaken by the Secretariat after sufficient funding is received, in advance, from States parties.

“In this connection, the Secretary-General advises that all final assessments which are outstanding for previous Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty and its Preparatory Committee should be remitted by the States parties to the Secretariat as soon as possible. Further, the application of credits of the States parties from previous Review Conferences to the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee would be carried forward only when the outstanding balances have been remitted.

“In summary, adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.21/Rev.1 would not give rise to financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.”

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada,

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

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

India, Israel, Pakistan.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.21/Rev.1 was adopted by 163 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/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): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev. 1, entitled “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Uzbekistan at the Committee's

18th meeting, on 20 October 2006. The sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland,

Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1 was adopted by 128 votes to 3, with 36 abstentions.

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

Mr. Mine (Japan): I would like to make a few remarks on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia". I am making these remarks on behalf of the delegations of the following eight countries, all of which voted in favour of this draft resolution: Austria, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Malta, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland and Japan.

The text of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia was signed on 8 September 2006 in Semipalatinsk by the five Central Asian States. Our eight delegations regard the signing of that text as an effort to strengthen peace and stability in the region and as a contribution to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Such a zone would be the first regional nuclear-weapon-free zone in the northern hemisphere and would encompass an area in which nuclear weapons previously existed.

As stipulated in the principles and guidelines of the 1999 report of the Disarmament Commission (A/54/42), it is important that the five nuclear-weapon States be consulted during the negotiations on each treaty establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone. That facilitates their signature to and ratification of the protocol relevant to such a treaty. In that regard, we take note of the expressed readiness of the five Central Asian States to continue consultations on a number of the Treaty's provisions. We will pay close attention to such future consultations among the States directly concerned, as outlined in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution before us. That forward-looking approach is an important element towards the future role of the Treaty: the strengthening of peace and stability in the region.

Finally, we would like to encourage the five Central Asian States to keep countries with an interest in this process informed about the developments related to their consultations.

Mr. Taalas (Finland): The European Union warmly welcomes the selection of Vienna as the venue for the first Preparatory Committee meeting of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The invitation was issued to mark the special occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Thus, we regard Vienna as an exceptional venue for hosting the first Preparatory Committee meeting. The European Union considers that that is not a precedent for future review cycles of the NPT.

I would like to thank the Permanent Mission of Brazil to the United Nations for conducting the consultations with great care and patience.

Mr. Landman (Netherlands): I have the honour to speak on behalf of 12 States Members of the United Nations. Together with the Netherlands, the delegations of Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Norway, Poland, Romania and Turkey abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

We attach great importance to nuclear-weapon-free zones for peace and security on the basis of arrangements freely entered into among the States of the region concerned. Our countries have consistently expressed their support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia. Therefore, we welcome in principle the initiative of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan aimed at establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia.

We fully support the efforts being made to pursue a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia. However, the conclusion of the Treaty without finalization of the consultations with the five nuclear-weapon States has resulted in a Treaty that does not formally establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone as set out in Article VII of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We therefore consider it essential that outstanding issues concerning this nuclear-weapon-free zone as referred to in, and in accordance with, operative paragraph 2 of the resolution, should be resolved. Further consultations in accordance with the United Nations Disarmament Commission guidelines are therefore necessary.

Mr. Csörsz (Austria): Speaking on resolution A/C.1/61/L.21/Rev.1, Austria wishes to align itself

with and support the statement delivered previously by Finland on behalf of the European Union.

Austria warmly welcomes the selection of Vienna as the venue for the first Preparatory Committee of the review cycle for the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to be held in spring 2007.

The Austrian Government has extended this invitation to mark the special occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Thus, Austria regards the holding of the Preparatory Committee in Vienna to be exceptional in view of this auspicious occasion. Austria understands that this situation does not set a precedent for future review cycles of the NPT.

Austria is grateful to all delegations for having favourably considered this invitation and for having agreed on the venue. In particular, my delegation would like to commend Brazil, sponsor and coordinator of the draft resolution, for its efforts.

Madam Chairperson, Austria is looking forward to welcoming you and all delegates to Vienna next spring and is confident that the stage will be set for substantial discussions to take place in a fruitful and optimistic spirit.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev. 1, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia. China's position on nuclear-weapon-free zones has been consistent and clear. We respect and support the efforts of the States in the region to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone on the basis of consultations and agreement freely reached by the States concerned, taking into consideration the reality of the region. We also believe that the establishment of such a zone is in the interest of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament and that it will contribute to the peace, security and stability of the region in question.

China has signed and ratified the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean, the South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone Treaty and the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty, as well as the relevant protocols. China has also reached a consensus with the Asian States for the Treaty on the South-east Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone and looks forward to its opening for signature at an early date.

China enjoys traditionally friendly and cooperative relationships with the five Central Asian States. We highly value and actively support the efforts of these States in establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia and welcome the fact that the five States have agreed on and signed the nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty. China will, as always, continue to support the efforts by States in other regions to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Mr. Meyer (Canada): I have asked for the floor to explain Canada's decision to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev. 1. Canada strongly supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We consider these to be important contributions both to nuclear disarmament and to nuclear non-proliferation. They are valuable measures for enhancing international security.

In the particular case of Central Asia, we are also very much in favour of creating a nuclear-weapon-free zone there. As the first such zone located entirely in the northern hemisphere, and one which includes a State, Kazakhstan, which renounced possession of nuclear weapons and joined the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear-weapon State, a Central Asian nuclear-weapon-free zone will be a welcome addition to similar zones that have already been established, in Latin America, Africa, South-East Asia and the South Pacific. It will also set a clear example for other regions where nuclear weapons have been stationed in the past to follow in the future.

Canada believes, however, that some more work is needed before this laudable enterprise can be fully realized.

Article 12 of the Semipalatinsk Treaty has raised concerns about the impact of pre-existing security arrangements on the Treaty and its core purpose. This ambiguity has prompted Canada's abstention at this time.

On the other hand, the process of resolving this question seems to be relatively straightforward, and the States of the region are ready to pursue further negotiations with the interested parties to this end. We thus very much hope that a solution can be arrived at expeditiously and count on the goodwill of all involved to make this happen.

Mr. Bar (Israel): I take the floor to give an explanation of the Israeli vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev. 1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia".

Israel is naturally sympathetic to the concept of mutually verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zones that are freely arrived at among all the States of that region. Still, we believe that other States that have legitimate security concerns pertinent to a particular zone should also preferably be engaged in order to enhance the efficacy of such arrangements.

In addition, on the normative level, we consider it highly advisable that resolutions related to zones free of nuclear weapons under discussion in international forums should strive for a consensus among all the relevant sides. Such a consensus can only reinforce the prospects of achieving such a zone.

In the absence of a consensus, Israel decided to abstain on this resolution.

Mr. Trezza (Italy): This is an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev. 1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia". Italy subscribes to the reference to nuclear-weapon-free zones made by the European Union presidency in paragraph 25 of its statement to the First Committee on 10 October of this year. We recall article VII of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which states that nothing in that treaty affects the right of any group of States to conclude regional treaties in order to assure the total absence of nuclear weapons in their respective territories.

We also acknowledge the importance of nuclear-weapon-free zones for peace and security on the basis of arrangements freely entered into among States of the region concerned. In this spirit, we welcome the decision of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan to establish a nuclear-weapons-free zone in Central Asia. We encourage those States to continue consultations on the Treaty signed at Semipalatinsk and on article 1 of its protocol.

Mr. Duncan (United Kingdom): I would like to make a joint explanation of vote on resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1 on the Central Asian nuclear-weapons-free zone treaty. I am speaking on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

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

Our primary reservation concerning this new treaty remains with regard to article 12, which indicates that existing treaty obligations of the States party would not be affected by this new Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone. We have never been given a satisfactory rationale for this article. The provisions of this new treaty must take precedence over any pre-existing treaty obligations that would fundamentally undermine its objective; otherwise, this treaty would have little meaning.

By signing the Treaty, the five Central Asian States have frozen the text and made future adjustments to it much more difficult. We would have preferred them not to have submitted a draft resolution to First Committee before we were able to resolve these issues.

For these reasons, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States are not in a position to endorse the Treaty signed on 8 September, nor can we adhere to any protocol based upon it. Our delegations therefore have had to vote “no” on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1. Nevertheless, we continue to stand ready to consult with them in order to arrive at a mutually satisfactory outcome.

Mr. MacLachlan (Australia): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

Australia is a strong supporter of nuclear-weapons-free zones freely arrived at by Member States. Australia has previously supported the consensus adoption of a resolution on the

establishment of a nuclear-weapons-free zone in Central Asia.

The agreement on a Central Asian nuclear-weapons-free zone was only very recently signed and, as we have just heard, we are aware that some countries have significant reservations about the final text of the agreement. In these circumstances, Australia does not believe it would be prudent to support this resolution, until we have had the opportunity to study fully all aspects of the agreement.

Mr. Carriedo (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Spanish delegation would like to express its agreement with the explanation of vote that has just been given by the delegation of the Netherlands after the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, entitled “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia”.

Spain fully supports the establishment of a nuclear-weapons-free zone on the basis of arrangements freely entered into between the States of the region concerned. Spain has always expressed its unequivocal support for the objectives of the treaties establishing a nuclear-weapons-free zone, as it believes that these zones are an important contribution to international peace and security, the strengthening of nuclear non-proliferation regime and also efforts conducive to nuclear disarmament.

Spain has consistently expressed its support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapons-free zone in Central Asia. Therefore, Spain welcomes and supports the initiative and efforts of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan towards establishing a nuclear-weapons-free zone in Central Asia.

However, the conclusion of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapons-Free Zone in Central Asia, without finalization of the consultations with the nuclear-weapon States, has resulted in a treaty that does not formally establish a nuclear-weapons-free zone as set out in article VII of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the 1999 United Nations Disarmament Commission guidelines on nuclear-weapons-free zones.

Therefore, Spain deems it essential that the outstanding issues concerning this nuclear-weapons-free zone — as referred to and in accordance with operational paragraph 2 of the draft resolution — are

resolved through further consultations and in accordance with the guidelines of the Disarmament Commission.

Mr. Denot Medeiros (Brazil): I wish to take this opportunity to explain the “yes” vote of Brazil on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, entitled “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia”.

As a State party to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean and a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20, entitled “Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas”, adopted last week by this Committee, Brazil is fully convinced that nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties, on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, contribute to the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects and contribute to the process of general and complete disarmament. They are measures that deserve the full support of the international community.

We therefore welcome the signature in Semipalatinsk, Kazakhstan of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia, and voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1. We hope that the General Assembly will be able, at an early date, not only to note, but indeed to welcome the actual establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region. For this purpose, we encourage the nuclear-weapon States to continue to engage in good-faith consultations with the Central Asian countries on the provisions of the Treaty.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): I have taken the floor to explain our vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.21/Rev.1. My delegation has abstained on the resolution in line with our known position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

Pakistan subscribes to the objectives of the NPT, although it is a non-NPT nuclear-weapon State. We are already fulfilling the NPT’s non-proliferation norms. Pakistan is prepared to continue to act in consonance with the general obligations in this regard. Because of the realities on the ground, we cannot, however, be expected to adhere to that treaty as a non-nuclear-weapon State.

Despite this limitation we recognize the important contributions made by the successive NPT

Review Conferences to address the issues of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. However, the current disarmament and non-proliferation regime is facing challenges to which we have drawn attention in our statement in this Committee. We sincerely hope that the next NPT Review Conference will explore ways to normalize the relationship between NPT and non-NPT nuclear-weapon States to make the NPT a living treaty, which is responsive to the realities of today.

Mr. Brasack (Germany): I have requested the floor to explain the vote of Germany, which abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

In principle, Germany was ready to vote, as some of our European Union (EU) partners did, in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, entitled “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia”, as a signal of support for the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones as a contribution to regional and global peace and security and as a means to promote nuclear disarmament, stability and confidence. It appeared important to us to give a signal of encouragement, particularly as concerns the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia.

Nevertheless, we share the concerns and views expressed earlier this afternoon by the delegation of the Netherlands on behalf of 12 countries. In the end, we decided to abstain in the voting to show our disappointment at the fact that suggestions that could have helped to bridge the existing differences between the parties concerned were, unfortunately, not taken into account by the sponsors of the draft resolution. Those suggestions would have provided a perspective for further joint efforts to make the nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia internationally recognized, including by the three nuclear-weapon States.

As a consequence, we feel that the current revised text does not reflect the balance we had hoped for. Under these circumstances, we do not see ourselves in a position, at this juncture, to support draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1. We hope that in the coming 12 months, efforts by all sides concerned will be undertaken to allow all parties concerned accession to the protocol of the Semipalatinsk Treaty.

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt): I am taking the floor in explanation of vote on the draft resolution contained in

document A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia.

The delegation of Egypt expresses its support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia and congratulates the Central Asian republics on the successful signing of the Treaty on 8 September 2006 in Semipalatinsk. At the same time, we express our appreciation for the readiness they have shown to continue consultations with the nuclear-weapon States leading towards the strengthening of the zone.

Egypt continues to support the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other regions of the world as an important measure towards achieving nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects, as well as to pave the way towards the achievement of regional and global peace and security.

We hope that we will witness the establishment, as soon as possible, in the Middle East, in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions as well as the 1995 resolution on the Middle East of the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), of such a zone, thereby strengthening efforts to preserve the NPT and paving the way towards the achievement of a lasting and comprehensive peace in the region of the Middle East.

For all those reasons, we have supported the draft resolution.

Mr. Adji (Indonesia): I am taking the floor to make a statement in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution. We welcome the decision of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia. We had hoped, however, that the draft resolution could be further strengthened to provide a strong signal on the importance of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

I recall that, at the signing of the Semipalatinsk Treaty, the Foreign Minister of Kazakhstan stated, among other things, that the “countries of our region declared a firm commitment to the principles of disarmament and non-proliferation”. This is in line with the agreed United Nations principle that the

establishment of zones free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction should be done on the basis of freely arrived at mutual agreement among the States of the region concerned and constitute an important disarmament measure.

My delegation believes that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone is a positive step and an important measure towards the strengthening of global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. That is why, at the recent Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement, held at Havana last September, Indonesia, along with the 117 countries of the Non-Aligned Movement that are also Members of the United Nations, welcomed the signing in Semipalatinsk of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia. We consider the establishment of such a zone an effective contribution to the strengthening of regional and global peace and security.

Finally, in accordance with the guidelines on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones adopted by the Disarmament Commission in 1996, it is up to the States in the region concerned to decide on the terms governing the zone, and it is the prerogative of the nuclear-weapon States to choose whether or not to offer further assurances to their members in the form of protocols on the nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty.

Mr. Anton V. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I am taking the floor to explain the vote of the Russian Federation on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

We congratulate Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan on the successful completion of the years of work that led to the signing of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia, which we welcome.

The establishment of that zone represents an important step towards the strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation regime at a time when such a regime is facing certain challenges. The Semipalatinsk Treaty will no doubt help to strengthen peace, security and stability in the region. It is significant, in this context, in terms of averting the threat of a nuclear weapon falling into the hands of international terrorists.

The Treaty is the result of lengthy, intensive and complex negotiations and consultations. We wish to underline in particular the significant contributions made by United Nations representatives and by the

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to the extensive preparatory work that was carried out with respect to the States of Central Asia.

In elaborating the Treaty, full account was taken of lessons learned from experiences in creating similar zones as well as all existing recommendations and regional characteristics. As was the case with other, similar zones, questions relating to the granting of security assurances and safeguards by individual nuclear-weapon States can be resolved fully during consultations using existing legal and other instruments. This is a standard practice that has been used in similar circumstances by Russia with respect to other zones. We would like to note the willingness of the participating States in Central Asia to consult further on the protocol to the Treaty. Here, of course, good sense and goodwill will be very important.

The Central Asian States have once again demonstrated a positive approach to dialogue here in the First Committee in preparing the text of the draft resolution.

Now that the Semipalatinsk Treaty has been signed, we have the task of ensuring its practical implementation. Russia will do its utmost to help in this process. We call upon all States to do likewise.

The Chairperson: If no other representative wishes to speak in explanation of vote or position after the voting under cluster 1, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, "Conventional Weapons".

I give the floor to the representative of Mali.

Mr. Mallé (Mali) (*spoke in French*): I would like to make a minor technical revision in draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.25, "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them".

Preambular paragraph 6 of the draft resolution should read:

"Taking note of the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons, adopted in 2005³".

In addition, the words "See also decision 60/519" should be added at the end of footnote 3.

The Chairperson: If no delegation wishes to make a general statement or to speak in explanation of vote before the vote under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons", the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.25, as orally revised.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.25, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them", was introduced by the representative of Mali on behalf of the Economic Community of West African States at the 16th meeting, on 18 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.25 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1, 2 and 3. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mozambique, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Slovenia, South Africa, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and Zambia.

The representative of Mali has just introduced an oral revision relating to the sixth preambular paragraph, which now reads:

(*spoke in French*)

"Taking note of the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons, adopted in 2005³".

(*spoke in English*)

Footnote 3 now includes the words

(*spoke in French*)

"See also decision 60/519".

(*spoke in English*)

With your permission, Madam, I will now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.25, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them".

“Under the terms of operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.25, the General Assembly would

‘[Invite] the Secretary-General and those States and organizations that are in a position to do so to continue to provide assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them’.

“The activities that would be required to implement the provisions of the resolution would be financed from available extrabudgetary resources. Therefore, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.25 would not give rise to financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.”

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.25, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.26. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 7.

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

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.26, entitled “Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus”, was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 16th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.26 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1 and 3.

The Committee will first take a vote on operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.26.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize,

Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, 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:

Japan, United States of America.

Operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.26 was retained by 163 votes to 2.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.26, entitled “Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus”, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Japan.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.26, as a whole, was adopted by 164 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Chairperson: The floor is now open to those delegations wishing to explain their vote on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Mine (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's position on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.26, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus". Japan, like other Member States, attaches great importance to resolving the problem of ammunition, which is inseparable from the issue of conventional weapons. It is thus Japan's belief that we should continue in-depth discussions and exchanges of views among Member States in order to adequately address the problem through the concerted efforts of the entire international community.

In our view, however, the discussions at the regional and global levels so far have not developed sufficiently for the international community to be able to share a common understanding of the matter. In the current situation, Japan is of the view that the establishment of the proposed group of governmental experts on ammunition would still be premature.

In that connection, I would like to draw the special attention of all Member States and the Department for Disarmament Affairs secretariat to Japan's concerns about the expansion of the United Nations budget. As Japan has stated on many occasions, it cannot accept that the uncontrolled expansion of the United Nations budget. With regard to groups of governmental experts, we believe that we should look very closely at their value and usefulness beforehand, and that their establishment should be restricted to cases where they can be expected to have real value, taking into consideration the necessity of healthy management of the United Nations budget and making maximum use of the scrapping and building of existing United Nations programmes. Japan will continue to pay close attention to this issue in the future.

Mr. Méndez (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.26, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus". We wish nevertheless to note that it is for each State to determine when the accumulation of

ammunition would be excessive. We also believe that the question of the illicit trafficking of ammunition is closely linked to the illicit trafficking of arms; the marking of ammunition is thus a very important aspect which could help prevent their diversion to illicit activities.

We believe the Governments of the countries with the main arms industries bear primary responsibility to adopt regulations to make it possible to bring about the marking of ammunition before export in order for them to be properly traced.

With reference to operative paragraph 7, our delegation believes that at this stage, it would have been better to complete the process of gathering the opinions of Member States, which would have made it possible to exchange points of view in order to determine the course of action to be followed in this matter.

The Chairperson: We shall proceed to take action on draft resolutions in cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security". I call first on those delegations wishing to make general statements on draft resolutions in cluster 5.

Mr. Dzundev (The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia): I would like to make a technical revision to the text of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.46/Rev.1. The final portion of the eighth preambular paragraph should read as follows:

"opening of the negotiations for a stabilization and association agreement with Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro, as well as resuming stabilization and association agreement negotiations with Serbia, pending full cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia,".

Mr. Taalas (Finland): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union. I would like to put on record that the oral revision just read out constitutes a factual correction and that the European Union fully supports it.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.46/Rev.1, as orally revised.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.46/Rev.1, entitled "Maintenance

of international security — good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe", was introduced by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at the 18th meeting of the Committee, on 20 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.46/Rev.1 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1-4. In addition, Canada, Luxembourg and the United States of America have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has just introduced an oral revision to the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. The revised eighth preambular paragraph should therefore read as follows,

"Noting the progress made by the countries of the region, including those of the Stabilization and Association Process, in fulfilling the criteria for membership in the European Union and, in this context, the start of the accession negotiations of Croatia and Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia becoming a candidate country for membership in the European Union, the signing of the Stabilization and Association Agreement with Albania and the opening of the negotiations for a stabilization and association agreement with Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro, as well as resuming stabilization and association agreement negotiations with Serbia, pending full cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia".

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.46/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chairperson: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolutions in cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

I call first on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. Taalas (Finland): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) regarding draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1, entitled "Declaration of a fourth

disarmament decade". The acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania, the candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Montenegro and Serbia, and the EFTA countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova align themselves with this declaration.

The European Union has decided to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1. The EU is a staunch supporter of effective multilateral action in the field of arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament, as expressed in our Security Strategy, our Strategy against Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and other EU instruments. We wish to contribute to the development of a stronger international community, well-functioning international institutions and a rules-based international order. This entails strengthening the United Nations and equipping it to fulfil its responsibility to act effectively.

We also believe it important that the work done by the global disarmament machinery effectively address the challenges before it. We attach great importance to the revitalization of the First Committee, among other things by reducing the number of draft resolutions submitted and by making them more operational.

We would like to recall that we support draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.4, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament" which will be adopted by the Committee at its current session and the aim of which is to mobilize the attention of the international community in the field of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation.

The European Union appreciates the intentions and the constructive spirit of the proposal by Sierra Leone, but remains to be convinced of the added value of the General Assembly at this session setting the agenda for the Disarmament Commission session in 2009.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1, entitled "Declaration of a fourth disarmament decade", because we share and support the objectives of the text. The draft resolution's submission is timely, because its adoption will allow

enough time to begin a proper process of preparation with a view to the declaration of a fourth disarmament decade starting in 2010. We all know well the difficult and complex situation that prevails in the sphere of disarmament and international security.

In the opinion of Cuba, the declaration of a fourth disarmament decade could make a positive contribution to mobilizing international efforts to emerge from the current stagnation and move forward towards the disarmament objectives to which we are all committed. The declaration of a fourth disarmament decade would also be a step forward in promoting multilateralism as a basic principle of negotiations on disarmament and non-proliferation in all their aspects, and in the light of the dangerous tendency on the part of some States to resort to unilateralism with increasing frequency.

The Chairperson: The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

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

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1, entitled "Declaration of a fourth disarmament decade", was introduced by the representative of Sierra Leone at the 16th meeting of the Committee, on 18 October 2006. The sponsor of the draft resolution is named in document A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab

Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted by 116 votes to 1, with 51 abstentions.

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

Mr. Quattrini (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): Switzerland abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1, entitled "Declaration of a fourth disarmament decade". Switzerland is aware of the difficulties faced by international arms control and disarmament negotiating forums. However, my delegation believes that the stalemates do not necessarily result from the existing structures, but rather from the lack of will of States to take part in negotiations because of their differing priorities.

Although my delegation appreciates the spirit and intentions of the Sierra Leone initiative, we are not convinced of its usefulness in the current context. Furthermore, Switzerland already supports the objectives of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.4, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". From that perspective, my delegation believes that draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1 runs counter to the objectives we set for ourselves two years ago with respect to revitalizing the First Committee.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". I call first on the representative of Indonesia, who wishes to make a general statement on this cluster.

Mr. Adji (Indonesia): I wish to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and to make a statement before the action on cluster 7. In the general debate of the First Committee, many delegations and groups of delegations have expressed their disappointment in the failure of major conferences in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation during the past year. In his statement, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs also recounted those setbacks. Many also reaffirmed the absolute validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation and were determined to promote multilateralism as an essential way to develop arms regulations and disarmament negotiations.

The cumulative effect of the negative developments has been the continuation of the nuclear arms race. There are plans for creating a new generation of nuclear weapons. We are also facing the distinct danger that terrorists will acquire those weapons, with potentially calamitous consequences. Concurrently, efforts to advance conventional weapons continue unabated in many parts of the world.

In the Final Document (resolution S-10/2) adopted by consensus at the conclusion of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, whose thirtieth anniversary we will be commemorating in 2008, 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 control, the immediate goal is the elimination of the danger of nuclear weapons.

In spite of the best efforts of the international community, adequate results have not been produced with the existing disarmament machinery. There is an urgent need for the machinery and forums appropriately constituted for disarmament deliberations and negotiations to be revitalized. Therefore, the role and responsibility of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament, in accordance with the Charter, must be strengthened.

Against that summary backdrop, with the adoption, without a vote, of resolution 59/71 in 2004, we have the responsibility to fulfil the mandate entrusted to us by the General Assembly. In that context, we believe that the substantive sessions of the Open-ended Working Group are the appropriate forum to make adequate preparations towards the convening of a fourth special session on disarmament. In 2003, a comprehensive set of proposals were submitted by the Non-Aligned Movement, the European Union and others during the sessions of the Open-ended Working Group. Those proposals were built based on the experiences of the past, as well as on existing disarmament agreements and the global norms that have served us so well. They also contained several new issues related to disarmament and international security.

We believe that the substantive sessions of the new open-ended working group will provide each Member State with an opportunity to make contributions to our common objectives and to share the responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

We remain confident that we will have a productive and effective exchange of views on relevant disarmament and non-proliferation issues. That will facilitate our quest for ways and means to ensure common security based on a balanced and comprehensive set of interests among all groups of States.

In that respect, the Non-Aligned Movement expresses its readiness to work closely and constructively with all Member States to fully utilize the forthcoming substantive sessions of the open-ended working group, which will be mandated to consider the objectives and the agenda of a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, including the establishment of its preparatory committee. The Movement urges all delegations to

provide their continued support, in fulfilment of the mandate entrusted to us by resolution 59/71 of 2004, which was adopted by consensus.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.4. 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.1/61/L.4, 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 19th meeting, on 23 October 2006. The sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/61/L.4.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, 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, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San

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

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Tonga.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.4 was adopted by 166 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Tonga advised the Secretariat that it had intended not to participate in the voting.]

The Chairperson: The Committee has thus concluded the third stage of its work, action on all draft resolutions and draft decisions submitted under disarmament and international security items.

Agenda item 110

Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

The Chairperson: In connection with this item, I should like to refer delegations to document A/C.1/61/1 — specifically, to the explanation contained in its paragraph 18, which reads as follows:

“The General Assembly decided to allocate item 110 also to all the Main Committees for the sole purpose of considering and taking action on their respective tentative programmes of work.”

A draft proposed programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2007, as contained in document A/C.1/61/CRP.6, was previously circulated to all delegations for their consideration. However, a revised document, A/C.1/61/CRP.6/Rev.1, was circulated this afternoon. The document was revised owing to the fact that the dates of the official United Nations holidays in 2007 have now been issued, including the date for Eid al-Fitr, which will be

12 October 2007. Consequently, that is reflected in document A/C.1/61/CRP.6/Rev.1. Thus, the Committee will have at its disposal a total of nine meetings, instead of 10, for thematic discussions and the introduction of draft resolutions. That is the only change in the document.

Following my consultation with the Chairman of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee), it has been agreed that both the First and Fourth Committees will begin their work during the first week as they have always done in the past, that is, in a sequential manner. However, the Fourth Committee has once again agreed to allow our Committee to hold both morning and afternoon meetings on Monday and Tuesday of the second week, which begins on 8 October. This draft programme will, of course, be finalized and issued in its final form before the Committee begins its substantive work at its next session.

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.1/61/CRP.6/Rev.1?

It was so decided.

Statement by the Chairperson

The Chairperson: Before I adjourn this meeting, allow me to make a brief statement in my capacity as Chairperson of the First Committee.

During this session of the First Committee, several delegations have drawn our attention to the many setbacks and problems that we have experienced in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation in recent years. But, as I said in my opening statement four weeks ago, the issues we are dealing with are of such fundamental importance that there is no alternative to trying harder, despite the obstacles and difficulties that we have to face.

In assessing this year's session of the First Committee, I note that there continues to be room for improvement as regards the repetitive nature of our work. But I think it is being gradually acknowledged that a resolution remains valid until it is replaced by another resolution on the same subject matter - and that does not need to happen every year.

Nonetheless, I also note that new, and very relevant, issues were introduced this year, including the

question of a possible international arms trade treaty. This is healthy for our work.

From the outset, I was determined to continue the process of improving the working methods of the Committee. I think that we have made some progress. In the United Nations, time is a costly commodity, but we have been able to utilize our allocated time better than in previous years. Delegations, by and large, respected my decision to start the meetings as scheduled, at 10 a.m. and 3 p.m., respectively. Some delays were unavoidable. However, that was not due to bad organization of our work, but rather resulted from the fact that delegations took greater interest in participating in the debates than anticipated. That is good news.

I think that the cluster approach to our debates proved valuable indeed. But we can do even better. Occasionally, the debates became fragmented and overlapped. This is an organizational challenge which I believe we can overcome. The Secretariat represents our collective memory, and I know that it will assist next year's Chairperson in rectifying the problems that we have identified this year.

The participation of experts and high-level officials from our arms control instruments also improved the quality of this year's debates in the Committee. Some adjustments will be needed in the future so as to ensure an optimal interactive dialogue between experts, officials and delegates.

Civil society contributed fruitfully to our deliberations on 19 October. I am pleased that delegations took considerable interest in exchanging views with non-governmental organizations on issues related both to nuclear weapons and to conventional arms.

In conclusion, I consider this year's session of the First Committee to have been a reasonably successful one. When we commenced our work, I asked members for their cooperation, and they certainly delivered. I do, indeed, appreciate that. Many representatives will now return to arms control diplomacy in other forums. I wish them all the best, and hope that they found at least some inspiration in this year's First Committee session.

Allow me also at this stage to express my sincere appreciation to all members of the Committee for the cooperation that they have extended to me throughout this session. It has certainly been a great privilege for

me to work with all of them. I also thank all delegations for their full cooperation and support in utilizing the time and facilities allocated to the First Committee in a truly efficient manner. It is my firm belief that the First Committee has again set the benchmark for all other Committees to follow in terms of its effective management of time and efficient use of conference facilities, particularly in connection with the use of the rolling list of speakers for the general debate and the interactive discussions that the Committee held.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my fellow Bureau members: the three Vice-Chairpersons, Mr. Andy Rachmianto of Indonesia, Mr. Federico Perazza of Uruguay and Mr. Boštjan Malovrh of Slovenia, and our Rapporteur, Mr. Abdelhamid Gharbi of Tunisia. Their collective wisdom and experience were instrumental in allowing me to effectively discharge my functions as Chairperson.

Allow me also, on behalf of the Committee, to offer my profound gratitude to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Tanaka, for the support that he and his staff from the Department for Disarmament Affairs have provided. On behalf of the Committee, I would also like to convey my heartfelt thanks to the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Jarmo Sareva, and all of his colleagues in the First Committee secretariat, for all of their tireless efforts throughout the past month.

My sincere appreciation goes also to all the interpreters, translators, record keepers, press officers, document officers, conference officers and sound engineers, who have been diligently working behind the scenes in order to support the Committee's work.

As I stated earlier during the session, the Committee will reconvene next year, some time in June, to elect its Chairman for the sixty-second session.

I give the floor to the representative of Indonesia.

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

Allow me, first of all, to extend our gratitude and appreciation to you, Madam, for your able and effective leadership in steering the work of the First Committee. Your chairmanship marks a historic milestone in the work of the Committee, as you are the first woman ever to preside over the Committee. We

would also like to commend you for continuing the measures taken by your predecessors to improve the effectiveness of the methods of work of the Committee.

The Non-Aligned Movement continues to believe that the rationalization of the work of the Committee is a process and that it should be continued in a transparent and comprehensive manner. We hope that it will be retained and further developed in forthcoming sessions of the Committee.

We have noted that more States participated in the Committee's general and thematic debates than in previous years. Formulating a work programme for the Committee that includes panel discussions with independent experts and non-governmental organizations is something that needs to be maintained and further developed. We see these developments as a positive indication of the growing relevance to Member States of the role and function of the First Committee.

As in previous years, the Non-Aligned Movement demonstrated a constructive and positive outlook by submitting six draft resolutions for the consideration of the Committee. Those draft resolutions received overwhelming support from member States, and some were even adopted without a vote. In this regard, the Movement would like to express its appreciation and gratitude to all of the delegations that supported those draft resolutions.

Let me also to take this opportunity, through you, Madam, to express our appreciation to the members of the Bureau, and to the Secretary of the Committee and his staff, for all of their hard work and assistance during our session.

Finally, the Non-Aligned Movement remains committed to promoting international peace and security, primarily through disarmament measures. We strongly believe that multilateralism and multilaterally agreed solutions, in accordance with the Charter, remain the only sustainable way to address disarmament and international security issues. It is our hope that multilateralism, within the framework of the United Nations, will provide much-needed impetus for moving the disarmament and non-proliferation agenda forward in our endeavours next year.

The Chairperson: I give the floor to the representative of Finland.

Mr. Taalas (Finland): Now that the First Committee has completed this stage of its work, the presidency of the European Union would also like to take this opportunity to say a few words of thanks.

First and foremost, we would like to thank you, our Chairperson Ambassador Mona Juul, for your dignified, skilled and punctual performance in carrying out your tasks. We also thank your dedicated team. As the first female to chair the Committee in living memory, your success is an argument for the continued appointment of women to positions of leadership. *Tusen takk* — a thousand thanks.

The European Union would also like to express its appreciation for the work of the Secretariat, both the Secretary of the First Committee and his team and the members of the Department for Disarmament Affairs. The efficiency and skill of the Secretariat has much facilitated our work this year.

The Chairperson: I thank the representatives of Indonesia and Finland for the kind words addressed to all of us.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.