



# General Assembly

Sixty-second session

## First Committee

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

Tuesday, 30 October 2007, 3 p.m.  
New York

*Official Records*

*Chairperson:* Mr. Badji . . . . . (Senegal)

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

### Agenda items 88 to 105 (continued)

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

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolutions submitted under cluster 1, on nuclear weapons. I shall now give the floor to representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

**Mr. Pereira Gomes** (Portugal): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". The EU will vote in favour of the draft resolution, and calls on all States in the region to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as non-nuclear-weapon States. We also call on all States in the region that have not yet done so to conclude a comprehensive safeguards agreement and to sign and ratify an additional protocol.

The EU supports the objective of the Middle East becoming a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. But we are concerned that this draft resolution does not cover some relevant developments with respect to nuclear proliferation in the region. Indeed the adoption of Security Council resolutions 1696 (2006), 1737 (2006) and 1747 (2007) reflects the international community's profound concerns over Iran's nuclear programme. We deplore Iran's continued failure to comply with

resolutions of the Security Council and of the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and we are greatly concerned by its defiance of the international community by continuing uranium-enrichment-related activities. Such a step directly contradicts the repeated requests of the IAEA Board of Governors, made mandatory by Security Council resolutions.

We appreciate the IAEA's continuous efforts to resolve long-standing issues relating to Iran's nuclear programme. The EU welcomes the agreement between Iran and the IAEA to resolve all questions concerning Iran's past nuclear activities. The EU notes that full and timely implementation by Iran of the IAEA workplan, as interpreted by the Director General's report, would constitute a significant step forward. Confidence in the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear programme requires that the IAEA be able to provide assurances regarding the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities through the implementation of the additional protocol and the required transparency measures. We urge Iran to cooperate fully in implementing the workplan in a complete and swift manner and in a constructive spirit, to assist the IAEA in its efforts by providing all access required by its safeguards agreement and by implementing the additional protocol, and to open the way for negotiations by complying with the requirements set out in Security Council resolutions 1696 (2006), 1737 (2006) and 1747 (2007).

The EU supports the statement on Iran issued on 28 September 2007 in New York by the foreign

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.



ministers of China, France, Germany, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States, with the support of the High Representative of the EU. Among other things, that statement welcomed the agreement between Iran and the IAEA to resolve all questions concerning Iran's past nuclear activities. Moreover, we note that the ministers agreed — in view of the fact that Iran has not fulfilled the requirements of Security Council resolutions 1696 (2006), 1737 (2006) and 1747 (2007), including the suspension of its enrichment-related and reprocessing activities — to finalize the text for a third draft Security Council sanctions resolution under article 41 of the Charter of the United Nations, with the intention of bringing it to a vote in the Council unless the November reports of Mr. Solana and Mr. ElBaradei showed a positive outcome of their efforts.

The EU remains committed to seeking a negotiated solution that will address the international community's concerns and allow Iran to develop a domestic nuclear industry for peaceful purposes. The EU recalls that talks to that effect held in Rome on 23 October by High Representative Javier Solana affirmed that a solution to the Iranian nuclear issue would contribute to global non-proliferation efforts and to realizing the objective of a Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction, including their means of delivery.

**Mr. Morro** (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Spain would like to make a statement in connection with draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.26, concerning the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty.

Spain has always believed that nuclear-weapon-free zones, established through consensual agreements freely arrived at by the States of the region concerned, are an important contribution to strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime and to efforts aimed at nuclear disarmament. With regard to this instance, Spain has unequivocally expressed its support for the goals of the Treaty of Pelindaba as a way of ensuring that no nuclear weapons shall be present or stationed on a continent so close to its shores. We have also done so also to express our desire that the Treaty enter into force as soon as possible.

Nevertheless, having very closely studied the invitation made to Spain to become a party to Protocol III to the Treaty of Pelindaba, my Government, in

consultation with parliament, has decided not to sign it. That decision, which was duly transmitted to the Treaty's depositary, was made for two basic reasons. First, the Treaty of Pelindaba contains no provision in the area of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation that Spain has not already adopted with respect to the whole of its national territory, which of course includes those areas that lie within the geographic scope of the Treaty. In ratifying international treaties and implementing unilateral measures, Spain has irrevocably and legally committed itself not to produce nuclear weapons, militarily denuclearize all of its territory and use nuclear energy solely for peaceful purposes. Moreover, in accordance with its membership of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the European Atomic Energy Community, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and NATO, it has already subscribed, and is adhering to, a series of obligations and safeguards that go significantly beyond those contained in the Treaty of Pelindaba.

Secondly, the signing and subsequent ratification of Protocol III would lead to the establishment of an unnecessary and redundant control regime for those parts of Spanish territory that fall within the Treaty's geographic zone of applicability, as those areas are under the overall control of the four international organizations covering the entire territory of Spain, to which I have referred.

Permit me to develop those arguments. I should like to emphasize that Spain is a country that has taken on broad commitments in the areas of arms control and non-proliferation. In addition to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we have ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, the Convention on Nuclear Safety, the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management, and the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.

All Spanish nuclear installations are devoted exclusively to the peaceful use of nuclear energy and are subjected to the twofold controls of the International Atomic Energy Agency and the European Atomic Energy Community, within the framework of the Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement signed with the IAEA by non-nuclear-weapon States members of the European Union. Furthermore, Spain, together with

those EU partners, has ratified an Additional Protocol to the Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement, which provides for a number of verification mechanisms that go considerably beyond those provided for in the Treaty of Pelindaba.

Likewise, Spain is pleased to contribute to the IAEA's African Regional Cooperative Agreement for Research, Development and Training Related to Nuclear Science and Technology for the funding of projects designed to promote peaceful uses of nuclear energy in Africa. In addition, those parts of Spanish territory included in the Treaty's geographic area of application are part of the European Union and therefore of the integration process that it represents. In the more specific area of security, they belong to the area covered by the North Atlantic Treaty, the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe and the Vienna Document 1994 of the Negotiations on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures. Those portions of Spanish territory are thus part of the area of the EU, NATO and the OSCE and thus should not have been included in the area envisaged by the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty.

Finally, I wish to recall that the entire Spanish territory, including the parts within the Treaty's geographic area of application, has been militarily denuclearized since the 1976 Treaty of friendship, defence and cooperation between Spain and the United States — a fact that has been reiterated in the successive revisions of the Treaty. Likewise, the prohibition of the introduction, installation or stockpiling of nuclear weapons anywhere on Spanish territory was included in our parliament's authorization to the Government to accede to the North Atlantic Treaty in October 1981 and was reiterated in 1985 and during the 1986 consultative referendum whereby Spain entered NATO. In short, within NATO, Spain has the status of a State militarily denuclearized throughout its national territory.

I wish to reiterate that my country has always considered nuclear-weapon-free zones to be an important contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security, and we fully agree with the objectives of the Treaty of Pelindaba. That is why Spain has joined the consensus on First Committee draft resolutions on this subject since they were first introduced, in 1997. Nevertheless, the Spanish delegation, as indicated in statements made in previous years in this context, does not consider itself

associated with that consensus as far as operative paragraph 3 of the present draft resolution is concerned. We continue to have serious reservations about the provisions of that paragraph because of the definitive and irreversible position of Spanish authorities regarding the impossibility of signing and ratifying Protocol III to the Treaty, for the reasons mentioned earlier.

Since 1997, Spain has striven to convey the message to the sponsors of the draft resolution on this subject — which remains unchanged this year — that there is a need for more balanced language in paragraphs 2 and 3, whose wording is discriminatory, as it singles out Spain from among the six States affected by the Protocols to the Treaty of Pelindaba. All Spanish efforts, in transparency and good faith, to make the language of those paragraphs more balanced have been in vain; every two years, both are repeated unchanged. That situation is not satisfactory to the Spanish delegation.

I wish to reiterate once again that what Spain is seeking is not to attempt to modify the Treaty or its Protocols, but only operative paragraph 3 of the General Assembly's biennial draft resolution on this subject, so that it can be acceptable to all parties concerned. Over the years, Spain has chosen not to break the consensus achieved regarding this draft resolution — which concerns an issue of such importance to my country — confident that our legitimate concerns could be met. So as not to add new worrisome elements at this difficult time for multilateral disarmament and non-proliferation forums, the Spanish delegation currently prefers not to question the consensus on this draft resolution, confident that satisfactory wording for its paragraph 3 can soon be found. To that end, Spain has maintained a very broad range of contacts with countries of the African continent. We regret the fact that the messages of understanding received in their capitals have not yet been reflected in the text before us today.

That is why the Spanish delegation intends to continue consultations with all interested delegations in the hope that we can, in a spirit of dialogue and pragmatism, arrive at a situation that is satisfactory to all.

**Mr. Choe Su Hon** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea strongly rejects the tenth

preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30. With the inclusion of that paragraph, which stresses the importance of so-called Security Council resolution 1718 (2006), the draft resolution has lost its true meaning for what it is seeking.

That Security Council resolution is nothing less than clear proof of the irresponsible and unfair actions of the Security Council. Our nuclear tests and ballistic missiles pose no threat to any country. Our war deterrent contributes to peace and security in the region of North-East Asia and beyond by ensuring a balance of power. Hidden in that paragraph is Japan's intention to place pressure on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and block the progress of the ongoing Six-Party Talks. No solution will be found by resorting to sanctions and pressure, as demonstrated by history.

For these reasons, my delegation will vote against the draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30 as a whole.

**Mr. Itzhaki** (Israel): The current situation vis-à-vis nuclear proliferation in the Middle East warrants the question whether draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", has any connection with reality. Apart from its blatant one-sidedness and lack of factual foundation, this document undermines rather than enhances confidence between States in the region.

There is no doubt that a risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East does indeed exist. Our region faces growing threats stemming from the non-compliance by some States with their international obligations. This is particularly true of Iran's ongoing clandestine activities in the nuclear sphere and its total disregard for International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and Security Council resolutions. Our region also suffers from the irresponsible behaviour of some States outside the region which continue to export missiles and technology related to weapons of mass destruction (WMD) to countries in the region.

Israel expects that under the title of "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", the international community would, as a minimum, call for compliance by States in the region with their relevant international obligations. Lamentably, this draft resolution chooses to ignore relevant IAEA and Security Council resolutions and the evidence contained in relevant reports regarding such violations. This draft resolution focuses entirely on Israel and singles it out. It does so while overlooking the

profound hostility of States in the region towards Israel and their refusal to engage in reconciliation while explicitly sending threats towards Israel's existence and its territorial integrity.

Adopting such a draft resolution will not serve the greater objective of curbing proliferation in the Middle East, but will rather compromise it. Nor will this draft resolution contribute to the role and standing of this body. The First Committee should not, once again, become a venue for discrimination.

We call upon members to vote against this draft resolution and to distance themselves from attempts to deviate the focus from addressing the real risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, which lower the credibility of this United Nations body.

**Mr. Denot Medeiros** (Brazil): I will explain our affirmative votes on three draft resolutions included in cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons": draft resolutions A/C.1/62/L.21, A/C.1/62/L.23 and A/C.1/62/L.30.

My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.21, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger" basically because we support the statement contained in the fourth preambular paragraph, that nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons are essential to removing the danger of nuclear war. We are also convinced that a review of nuclear doctrines, as called for in operative paragraph 1, is indispensable to reduce the risk of unintentional and accidental use of nuclear weapons, including through de-alerting and de-targeting of such weapons.

Reducing the so-called nuclear danger cannot, however, in any way be a substitute for multilaterally agreed disarmament measures. Only irreversibility, transparency and verification would make disarmament measures fully consistent with the obligations of article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and with the 13 practical steps agreed upon by consensus at the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

My delegation, moreover, would like to qualify the view expressed in the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.21, that the use of nuclear weapons poses the most serious threat to mankind. It is our opinion of the mere existence of these weapons — not to mention, of course, the use — already constitutes a grave risk to the whole world. Therefore, we would have preferred that the main thrust of the

draft resolution to be more in line with the fourth preambular paragraph, which is rather straightforward in mentioning the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Turning now to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.23, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", I would like to explain that Brazil will also vote in favour of this text, basically because we support, as started in the third preambular paragraph, that a multilateral, universal and binding agreement prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons would indeed contribute to the elimination of the nuclear threat. We also deem positive the reference in the seventh preambular paragraph to such an international agreement leading to the ultimate destruction of nuclear weapons. Negative security assurances, however, cannot be a substitute for multilaterally agreed disarmament measures, which, as I just stated, should be irreversible, transparent and multilaterally verifiable.

Moving finally to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", I would like to explain that, as a member of the New Agenda Coalition for nuclear disarmament (NAC), Brazil will vote in favour of the draft resolution, because we believe, as stated in the first preambular paragraph, that all States should take further practical steps and effective measures towards the elimination of nuclear weapons. The general thrust of the draft resolution, in our view, is totally compatible with NAC positions, as presented recently to the first session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2010 NPT Review Conference, held in Vienna last May. For example, Brazil traditionally supports the position contained in operative paragraph 1 on the importance of all States parties to the NPT complying with the obligations under all articles of the Treaty.

We also support the reaffirmation in paragraph 3 of the importance of the universality of the Treaty. Likewise, while stressing the importance of maintaining existing moratoriums on nuclear-weapon test explosions, we also urge all States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty at the earliest opportunity, as called for in paragraph 9.

Finally, I should also point out that the call in paragraph 13 for the universalization of the IAEA

additional protocol is a provision on which we have reservations. However, draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30 as a whole deserves our general support since there is, indeed, a need for renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the international community as represented in this General Assembly at precisely this juncture of United Nations history.

**Ms. Vatne** (Norway): The Norwegian delegation would like to associate itself with the views expressed by the representative of Portugal on behalf of the European Union in its explanation of vote regarding draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

**Mr. Milton** (Australia): My delegation would like to make an explanation of vote in relation to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2, "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

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

Australia staunchly supports the right of all Middle East States to exist and to live in peace within secured and defined boundaries. Regrettably, however, Australia continues to have a number of substantive difficulties with this draft resolution, notably its emphasis on the State of Israel, with no reference to other Middle Eastern States of nuclear proliferation concern.

In September 2005, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Board of Governors, reflecting continuing international concern about Iran's nuclear intentions, found Iran to be in non-compliance with its NPT safeguards agreement. Following the Board's referral of the Iran nuclear issue to the Security Council, in July 2006 the Security Council made mandatory the suspension of all Iran's enrichment- and reprocessing-related activities. Iran has yet to comply with that legally binding resolution. It is regrettable that the proposed draft resolution makes no reference to the international community's serious concerns about this matter.

Australia is committed to preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and to the goal of a nuclear-free world. As a strong supporter of the NPT, we will continue to promote those objectives in the current NPT review cycle, as in all other international forums.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting.

The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.1. In that connection, I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.1, entitled “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East”, was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 16th meeting, on 24 October 2007. The sponsor of the draft resolution is named in document A/C.1/62/L.1.

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.1 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson**: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate recorded vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”, was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 16th meeting, on 24 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.2 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3.

A separate recorded vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2. The Committee will now take a separate vote on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2, which reads as follows:

“Recognizing with satisfaction that, in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-

Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Conference undertook to make determined efforts towards the achievement of the goal of universality of the Treaty, called upon those remaining States not parties to the Treaty to accede to it, thereby accepting an international legally binding commitment not to acquire nuclear weapons or nuclear explosive devices and to accept Agency safeguards on all their nuclear activities, and underlined the necessity of universal adherence to the Treaty and of strict compliance by all parties with their obligations under the Treaty”.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former

Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

India, Israel, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Bhutan, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Mauritius, Pakistan, Uganda

*The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 161 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2 as a whole. I give the floor to the Secretary to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now voting on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”, as a whole.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco,

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Australia, Cameroon, Canada, Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, India

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2 as a whole was adopted by 164 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/62/L.6. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/62/L.6, entitled “United Nations conference to identify appropriate ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament”, was submitted by the representative of Mexico. The sponsor of the draft decision is named in document A/C.1/62/L.6.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The sponsor of draft decision A/C.1/62/L.6 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. Is there any objection to that request?

**Ms. Rocca** (United States of America): We would like to ask for a recorded vote on draft decision A/C.1/62/L.6.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): A recorded vote has been requested on draft decision A/C.1/62/L.6. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now voting on draft decision A/C.1/62/L.6, entitled “United Nations conference to identify appropriate ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament”.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

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

*Draft decision A/C.1/62/L.6 was adopted by 123 votes to 3, with 44 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.8. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate recorded vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.8, entitled “Follow-up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed to at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons”, was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the 11th meeting, on 18 October 2007. The sponsor of the draft resolution is named in document A/C.1/62/L.8.

A separate recorded vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.8. The Committee is now taking a separate vote on that paragraph, which reads as follows:

“Reaffirming the resolution on the Middle East adopted on 11 May 1995 by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty, in which the Conference reaffirmed the importance of the early realization of universal adherence to the Treaty and placement of nuclear facilities under full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.”

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados,



Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bhutan, Burundi, Equatorial Guinea, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Russian Federation, Samoa

*The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 102 votes to 48, with 11 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft

resolution A/C.1/62/L.8 as a whole. I give the floor to the Secretary to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now voting on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.8, entitled "Follow-up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed to at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons", as a whole.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro,

Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Azerbaijan, Burundi, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Guatemala, India, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Samoa

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.8 as a whole was adopted by 103 votes to 53, with 15 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.10. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.10, entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 21st meeting, this morning. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.10, A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3/Add.1. In addition, Dominica and Indonesia have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

Earlier today, at the 21st meeting, the representative of Mexico introduced an oral revision to paragraph 3 by which the words "implementation of the agreements reached" would be replaced by the words "to implement the declaration adopted". The paragraph should therefore read as follows:

"Encourages States members of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean to continue its activities and efforts with a view to implement the declaration adopted at the first Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held in Tlatelolco, Mexico, from 26 to 28 April 2005".

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): 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.1/62/L.10, as orally revised, was adopted.*

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/62/L.20. 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 decision A/C.1/62/L.20, entitled "Missiles", was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the 11th meeting, on 18 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/62/L.20.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

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

*Draft decision A/C.1/62/L.20 was adopted by 117 votes to 6, with 51 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.21. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.21, entitled “Reducing nuclear danger”, was introduced by the representative of India at the 11th meeting, on 18 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.21, A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3/Add.1. In addition, Jamaica and Jordan have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

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

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

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, 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, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, China, Eritrea, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.21 was adopted by 113 votes to 50, with 13 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.23. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.23, entitled “Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons”, was

introduced by the representative of India at the 11th meeting, on 18 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.23, A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3/Add.1 and Add.2. In addition, Jamaica and Jordan have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, 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, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.23 was adopted by 115 votes to 50, with 11 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.25. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.25, entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, at the 15th meeting, on 23 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/62/L.25.

This morning, at the 21st meeting, the representative of Nigeria introduced oral revisions to paragraphs 5 and 9, by which both paragraphs would contain references to the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly, instead of the sixty-third.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): 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.1/62/L.25, as orally revised, was adopted.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.26. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.26, entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, at the 15th meeting, on

23 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/62/L.26.

This morning, at the 21st meeting, the representative of Nigeria introduced an oral revision to paragraph 6, by which a reference would be made to the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly, instead of the sixty-third.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): 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.1/62/L.26, as orally revised, was adopted.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30, entitled “Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, was submitted by the representative of Japan. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.30 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.1. In addition, Lebanon and Montenegro 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, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, 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, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, India, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Bhutan, China, Cuba, Egypt, France, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30 was adopted by 165 votes to 3, with 10 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.36. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.36, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*”, was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the 11th meeting, on 18 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.36 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.1 and Add.2.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Romania, Serbia, Switzerland, Tajikistan,

the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.36 was adopted by 121 votes to 25, with 29 abstentions.*

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

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.40. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.40, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Myanmar at the 11th meeting, on 18 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.40 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, India, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malta, Mauritius, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sweden, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.40 was adopted by 113 votes to 45, with 17 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.44. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.44, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 20th meeting, on 29 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.44 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.1 and Add.2.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba,

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

United States of America

*Abstaining:*

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.44 was adopted by 120 votes to 1, with 54 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): We have thus taken action on those draft resolutions in cluster 1 scheduled for this afternoon. I now give the floor to representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote

or position on the draft resolutions or decisions just adopted.

**Mr. Streuli** (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I would like to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2, "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". This year, Switzerland has once again voted in favour of the draft resolution on this item. This resolution is intended principally to achieve the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and is addressed to the only country in the region that has not ratified this treaty.

While supporting these efforts, Switzerland also attaches a great deal of importance to better implementation of existing obligations. We will continue to defend this position in the field of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation as well. In this context, the full cooperation of States with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is essential. In this context, my country shares the concerns expressed by the Board of Governors of the IAEA and by the Security Council vis-à-vis the Iranian nuclear issue. Switzerland fully supports Security Council resolutions 1696 (2006), 1737 (2006) and 1747 (2007), and calls upon Iran to comply with them as soon as possible.

By the title of the draft resolution, "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", Switzerland understands the text to be a political appeal against nuclear proliferation throughout the region. In order to ensure the broadest possible support for the draft resolution, it is essential that its sponsors take into account all the current developments that affect all the countries of the region.

**Mr. Itzhaki** (Israel): Israel has once again joined the consensus on the draft resolution entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", which appears this year in document A/C.1/62/L.1, notwithstanding our substantive reservations regarding certain elements of the draft resolution. We have done so since Israel remains committed to the vision of a Middle East developing into a zone free of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons, as well as of ballistic missiles. Yet, we are also realistic enough to know that, in the current realities of the Middle East, that noble vision is not going to materialize any time soon.

This year, Israel has decided to maintain the consensus on this draft resolution despite reference to this year's non-consensual resolution of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) General Conference concerning the application of the Agency's safeguards in the Middle East. It is regrettable that a non-cooperative spirit has characterized the IAEA General Conference's handling of that resolution. We hope that this spirit will not also gain ground in the First Committee through a further mention of the IAEA General Conference's resolution in a future draft resolution of the First Committee.

Israel has always maintained that the nuclear issue, as well as all regional security issues, conventional and non-conventional alike, can be realistically addressed only within the regional context. As the international community has recognized, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should emanate from the region. It can only be based on arrangements freely arrived at through direct negotiations among the States of the region and those directly concerned. Such a zone cannot be imposed from the outside; nor can it be made to emerge before the conditions for it have ripened.

Israel believes that the political realities in the Middle East mandate a gradual process, based on a step-by-step approach. This process should begin with modest confidence-building measures carefully selected so as not to detract from security margins of any regional State, followed by the establishment of peaceful relations, reconciliation, mutual recognition and good-neighbourliness, and complemented by conventional and non-conventional arms control measures. This approach can, in due course, lead to more ambitious goals, such as the establishment of a mutually verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Such a process is also grounded in the vast experience gained in other regions. Moreover, since the ultimate goal in the Middle East, as in other regions, is regional peace and security, the process of arms control negotiations should adequately address the threat perceptions of all participating States and must not hamper the security of any given party. Clearly, this process cannot begin in situations where some of the parties concerned still maintain a state of war with each other, refuse in principle to maintain peaceful relations with Israel and even call for its destruction.



In this context, it should be recalled that in the Middle East, unlike in other regions in the world where nuclear-weapon-free zones have been established, there are continued threats in the region and beyond against the very existence of one State, namely Israel. These threats are significantly exacerbated by the irresponsible behaviour of certain States concerning the export of weapons of mass destruction and related technologies to the region and the discrepancies between their commitments and their actual behaviour.

These circumstances and the poor track record of non-compliance with international obligations by several States in the region have a critical impact on the ability to embark on a joint process of regional security-building that could eventually lead to a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Let us bear in mind that three out of the four recognized cases of non-compliance with Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) have taken place in the Middle East, and one of them, Iran, is still now showing signs of compliance with its international obligations.

Israel has reiterated its vision of promoting regional peace and security. However, progress towards realizing this vision cannot be made without a fundamental change in regional circumstances, and not least without a significant transformation in the attitude of States in the region towards Israel. It is therefore our view that efforts in this context should be directed towards the creation of a stable environment of peace and reconciliation in our part of the world. Israel will continue to dedicate all its efforts to achieve that goal. We call upon our neighbours to do the same.

**Mr. Dobelle** (France) (*spoke in French*): My delegation is taking the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30, entitled “Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”. This year, France abstained in the vote on this draft resolution presented by Japan on nuclear disarmament. We know well Japan’s devotion to the cause of nuclear disarmament and its support for the final goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons. We understand it and respect it, but as we have explained in previous years when voting, the text of this draft resolution, which has not evolved over the past two years, continues, in our view, to present difficulties.

In 2005 and 2006, we supported the draft resolution presented by Japan, while expressing strong reservations on certain of its paragraphs. We made this

choice in order to show our “support for States that are considering the issue of nuclear disarmament seriously and in good faith” (A/C.1/61/PV.21, p.8). But our reservations persist, and unfortunately, they have not been adequately taken into account in the text, despite our proposals and our willingness to engage in constructive dialogue. May I therefore reiterate here our reservations with respect to this text.

In operative paragraphs 4 and 7, the principle of irreversibility and the new reductions in the operational status of nuclear weapons systems that the text calls for can be envisaged only in a manner that is disconnected from the analysis of the strategic context and international security and stability conditions. Therefore, the statement that this principle or these measures must be implemented “in a way that promotes international ... security” (A/C.1/62/L.30, *para. 4*) does not mean the same thing to us. We consider efforts to increase transparency, mentioned in operative paragraph 4, as a voluntary confidence-building measure aimed at promoting further progress in the area of disarmament. We should like to see that concept reflected in the text.

Paragraph 8 differs significantly from the language that we support concerning the ultimate goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons; the process of eliminating nuclear weapons that it mentions has not been placed in the context of general and complete disarmament. It also refers to a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies, which we cannot support, because nuclear deterrence remains an essential foundation of France’s security. Finally, paragraph 11 does not place negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty in the context of the Conference on Disarmament, which, from our point of view, is the only appropriate forum for such negotiations.

Since our suggestions regarding amendments have not always been taken into account, we cannot take the same approach that we took in 2005 and 2006. Our abstention must in no way be interpreted as calling into question our resolve to honour our commitments under article VI of the NPT. The major efforts that France has already made in the area of nuclear disarmament attest to our good faith — in particular, our ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), the dismantling of the Pacific Nuclear Test Centre, the moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and the dismantling of the relevant production facilities, the

significant reduction of our arsenal and the reduction in the number of missile-launching nuclear submarines. Here, I also wish to stress my country's efforts, and its commitment, to establish a CTBT verification regime.

Finally, France is prepared to begin negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty without delay within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament. We believe that, in order to continue the efforts that have begun, the international community must give priority to two subjects: the entry into force of the CTBT and the launching of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty.

**Mr. Khalilullah** (Pakistan): I have taken the floor to explain our vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/62/L.30 and A/C.1/62/L.40.

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30 is entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". My delegation does not agree with several provisions of the draft resolution, because the text places a lopsided emphasis on non-proliferation, rather than nuclear disarmament. Indeed, that reflects a regression in this vital area.

In accordance with our consistent position, we cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear-weapon State without conditions. Nor do we consider ourselves bound by any of the provisions emanating from the NPT Review Conferences or other forums in which Pakistan is not represented. While my delegation supports the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, we cannot agree to some of the proposals contained in this draft resolution, which are both selective and unrealistic. In view of those reservations, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

I will now explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.40, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". The achievement of nuclear disarmament is a goal that Pakistan has always supported. My delegation agrees with a number of elements contained in the draft resolution, including, *inter alia*, with regard to negative security assurances. However, we remain convinced that the draft resolution's references to documents and recommendations of the NPT Review Conferences are unwarranted. Therefore, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution, in keeping with our well-known position on the NPT.

**Mr. Grinius** (Canada): I would like to explain Canada's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". Delegations will recall that Canada took the floor after the vote on last year's draft resolution on this subject to register our concern at the lack of balance evidenced by the absence in the text of any reference to other nuclear proliferation risks in the Middle East region.

To the degree to which this draft resolution is intended to recognize that the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Middle East would pose a serious threat to international peace and security, we regretted that Iran had failed to bring itself into compliance with the binding requirements set out in Security Council resolution 1696 (2006). Since that time, the issue of Iran's nuclear activities has remained unresolved. As the representative speaking on behalf of the European Union and others said before the vote, Iran remains in non-compliance with its international obligations under Security Council resolutions 1747 (2007), 1737 (2006) and 1696 (2006). Iran has chosen to ignore those Security Council obligations and the efforts of the international community to arrive at an equitable and lasting solution that would meet the concerns of the international community with regard to Iran's intentions.

If — I repeat, if — the goal of this draft resolution is to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Middle East, as its title would seem to indicate, then the contents of the draft resolution should, in our view, address the obligation of all States in the region to adhere clearly and unequivocally to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and to fully comply with the obligations set out therein.

In the absence of more balanced language in that regard, Canada chose once again to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution under this item. We did, however, vote in favour of its sixth preambular paragraph.

**Mr. Litavrin** (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): At the outset, I should like to thank those countries whose representatives have spoken in support of the joint Russian-United States statement on missiles. I wish to comment on our position regarding the cluster on nuclear weapons.

The Russian Federation has always consistently advocated the strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and has made every effort to promote nuclear disarmament. Our country has ratified and implements all agreements on genuine and realistic nuclear disarmament. We have traditionally supported the idea of establishing zones free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in various regions, including the Middle East. A nuclear-weapon-free zone there would be in the long-term interests of all States in the region, without exception, and would promote a political settlement of the problems in the Middle East. Therefore, we call once again on Israel to become a member of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

We voted in support of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30, sponsored by Japan. We see it as a good example of a balanced combination of the various aspects of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. In this context, our delegation has supported the idea of reducing the operational status of nuclear weapons, which is part of this resolution. I remind members that we have always supported and continue to support the package approach that was achieved in 2000 at the NPT Review Conference.

On the basis of all those factors, we have not supported some of the draft resolutions in this cluster. Since, as we see it, the total elimination of nuclear weapons is only possible by step-by-step, gradual progress on the basis of an integrated approach in which all nuclear States are involved and in which strategic stability is retained. In the draft resolutions in question, we did not find this balanced combination or an expression of the priorities and of the efforts now being undertaken by countries including Russia to support strategic stability as we reduce nuclear weapons.

**Mr. Prasad (India):** My delegation has taken the floor to explain its votes or positions on draft resolutions under cluster 1, on nuclear disarmament, on which we have just taken action.

I begin with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". India abstained in the vote on A/C.1/62/L.2 as a whole and voted against its sixth preambular paragraph, as it believes that the focus of this draft resolution should be limited to the region that it intends to address.

India's position on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is well known. The 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which codifies the prevailing customary international law, provides that States are bound by a treaty based on the principle of free consent. The call to those States remaining outside of the NPT to accede to it and accept International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards on all their nuclear activities is at variance with that principle.

I would like to turn now to the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes", contained in document A/C.1/62/L.25, on which India was happy to join the consensus. India has been fully supportive of the central objective of this draft resolution, and it was one among the few countries which have supported the retention of radioactive weapons on the agenda on the Conference on Disarmament, as we believe that the international community must remain vigilant to the dangers posed by nuclear or radioactive wastes and to the possibility of their military use.

Paragraph 8 of the draft resolution refers to the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management. As a developing country, India places high importance not only on the safety but also on the full utilization of all aspects of the fuel cycle to derive maximum benefits from it. We consider spent fuel to be not waste, but a valuable resource, a position that India has been consistently supporting at the IAEA.

I would now like to turn to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.30, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". The basic intent of the draft resolution, namely the total elimination of nuclear weapons, is fully shared by India. We agree that the ultimate objective of States is general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, as set out in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2). We also appreciate the commitment of the Japanese people and Government to that goal.

We find, however, that the draft resolution incorporates certain elements that are not acceptable to our delegation, such as the call to join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear weapon State. As a consequence, even while agreeing

with the basic objective of the resolution — that is, the global elimination of nuclear weapons — we were constrained to vote against the draft resolution.

Finally, on draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.40, entitled “Nuclear disarmament”, India shares the objective of the draft resolution, which is to totally eliminate nuclear weapons and to create a nuclear-weapon-free world. The Non-Aligned Movement has accorded the highest priority to that goal and, like Myanmar and the other supporters and sponsors of this draft resolution, we remain committed to achieving it. This has been reiterated by our Prime Minister in the Indian parliament, where he said our commitment to work towards the universal, non-discriminatory and total elimination of nuclear weapons remains undiminished. We were, however, constrained to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution because of certain references to the NPT, on which India’s position is well-known.

**Ms. Bolaños-Pérez** (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): Our explanation of vote refers to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.8. Guatemala considers the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to be the cornerstone of the nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament regime, and, as a party to the Treaty, we reaffirm our full and unreserved commitment to respecting its provisions. Likewise, Guatemala emphasizes the importance of the NPT Review Conferences, which are intended to strengthen the Treaty and its review process. We are committed to following up on the obligations agreed to at all the Review Conferences of States parties, particularly those of 1995 and 2000, where we affirmed the need to continue to move with determination towards the full realization and effective implementation of the Treaty, as stated in draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.8.

However, Guatemala is of the view that other resolutions, of the Security Council and of the International Atomic Energy Agency, place this specific text in a context about which we have some doubt. That is why we chose to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.8.

**Ms. Rocca** (United States of America): We would like to give an explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/62/L.2, L.20, L.30 and L.44.

Beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2, my delegation voted “no” on the draft resolution, “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”. The

United States believes that, again this year, the draft resolution on this subject fails to meet the fundamental tests of fairness and balance. It confines itself to expressions of concern about the activities of a single country, omitting any reference to other issues related to nuclear proliferation in the region. Nor does it allude to the steps that some Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) States parties in the region are taking to develop the capacity to acquire nuclear weapons. Additionally, it does not comment on the failure of some States to conclude safeguards agreements. Nor does it recommend that all States in the region sign the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) additional protocol on safeguards. These deficiencies are particularly notable in the light of recent developments in the region.

Turning to draft decision A/C.1/62/L.20, “Missiles”, the United States has repeatedly made clear that it disagrees with the inclusion of the sub-item entitled “Missiles” on our agenda. Consequently, our delegation has, again, voted against this draft decision. However, as the United States is participating in the Panel of Governmental Experts, called for last year, our delegation would like to reiterate that we continue to urge the current third Panel on the subject to draw extensively on the work of the previous two Panels and to promptly complete its work.

Turning to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30, “Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, the United States considers that, of all the draft resolutions introduced on nuclear disarmament, this is the most balanced and realistic. In particular, we note its support for compliance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, its recognition of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Strategic Offensive Reductions, its call for the immediate commencement of negotiations on a fissile materials cut-off treaty and its positive mention of IAEA comprehensive safeguards agreements and the additional protocol. This year, we also support the draft resolution’s stress on the importance of Security Council resolution 1718 (2006) and join in welcoming progress in the Six-Party Talks. At the same time, the United States will continue to vote against this draft resolution because of its support for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, in paragraph 9. As members are aware, the United States opposes that Treaty.

Finally, turning to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.44, “Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons”, the United States voted against that draft resolution on concluding arrangements on negative security assurances. We wish to reiterate that, as we have made clear in other contexts, the United States continues to oppose any proposal for a negative security assurances treaty or other global legally binding security assurances regime.

**Mr. Najafi** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation regarding draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.1, entitled “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East”, and draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”.

For nearly three decades since Iran’s first initiative in 1974, the General Assembly has consistently recognized that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone would greatly enhance international peace and security. Obviously, adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons by all parties directly concerned is essential to ensuring the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. As the final document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference signifies, all in the Middle East region except for the Israeli regime have become parties to the Treaty. Regrettably, that regime, by refusing to submit itself to any type of international monitoring, continues to be the only impediment to realizing such a zone in the Middle East.

Addressing the threat posed by the unabated nuclear weapons programme of that regime to regional and international peace and security requires meaningful actions. It is no secret that the United States, through the adoption of extremely damaging policies, is actively hindering any meaningful action in international forums to address this real threat. Hypocritical policies and the application of double standards are detrimental to the interests of the region and the international community.

Being indifferent towards Israeli nuclear weapons is not an option. In that context, we also urge certain European countries to avoid inconsistency in their approach to the non-proliferation regime. Such an inconsistent approach has sent a wrong message to the

regime in question, to the extent that even its Prime Minister has publicly acknowledged the unlawful possession of weapons of mass destruction with impunity. If those Western States continue to turn a blind eye towards this real proliferation threat, they will lose their remaining credibility throughout the Middle East region.

Unjustified and unwarranted focus on peaceful and safeguarded nuclear facilities rather than efforts to address the existing proliferation threat posed by the unsafeguarded and secret nuclear weapons installations of the Zionist regime is counterproductive and constitutes a dangerous distraction.

We remain committed to the vision of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and continue to work with like-minded countries in the region and beyond for a united and effective front to promote that goal, and to promote peace and stability.

**Mr. Tarui** (Japan): I would like to explain Japan’s position on the vote on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/62/L.36, L.40 and L.44.

First of all, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.36, entitled “Follow-up to the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*”, we highly appreciate Malaysia’s sincere attitude and firm commitment to the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament, which led to the proposal of this draft resolution. Japan also believes that, because of their immense power to cause destruction and death and injury to human beings, the use of nuclear weapons is clearly contrary to the fundamental humanitarianism that provides the philosophical foundation of international law. Therefore, we would like to stress that nuclear weapons should never be used again and that continuous efforts should be made towards achieving a world free of nuclear weapons.

However, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, which this draft resolution addressed, clearly demonstrates the complexity of the subject. Japan supports the unanimous opinion of the judges of the International Court of Justice on the existing obligations under international law to pursue nuclear disarmament and to conclude negotiations on the matter in good faith. Japan firmly believes that we must take concrete measures to achieve steady, step-by-step progress in

nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. In that context, we believe it is premature to call on

“all States immediately to fulfil that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons”.  
(A/C.1/62/L.36, para. 2)

We believe that such steady, incremental progress should be made prior to our embarking upon the negotiations that the draft resolution calls upon all States to commence. That is the reason for Japan’s abstention on this draft resolution.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.40, entitled “Nuclear disarmament”, Japan shares its ultimate goal, namely, the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In that regard, my delegation takes note of positive elements concerning nuclear disarmament in this draft resolution. My delegation appreciates the fact that it contains a reference to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as the cornerstone of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament agreed in the final document of the 2000 Review Conference. However, the draft resolution does not contain elements that are necessary for the international community, including nuclear-weapon States, to form an agreement towards nuclear disarmament. My delegation firmly believes that steps towards nuclear disarmament should be realistic and progressive, with the involvement of the nuclear-weapon States. Therefore, my delegation would prefer to see an approach different from that proposed in this draft resolution towards the shared goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. That is the reason for Japan’s abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.40.

With regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.44, entitled “Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons”, which Japan supported in the voting, I should like to take this opportunity to stress that the issue of negative security assurances should be dealt with without prejudice to, and be based on the results of, the ongoing discussions in the Conference on Disarmament.

**Mr. Shamaa** (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The Egyptian delegation would like to explain its vote on

the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/62/L.8 and L.30.

The delegation of Egypt voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.8 because the text accords with Egypt’s continuous call for the full implementation of commitments and obligations with respect to nuclear disarmament, as stipulated by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT); the commitments and obligations agreed to in the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference; and the final document of the 2000 Review Conference, including the 13 practical steps for nuclear disarmament in realization of the international obligation to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

At the same time, the Egyptian delegation would like to express its deep regret that some delegations opposed the sixth preambular paragraph, which reaffirms the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference, in which the Conference reaffirmed the importance of the early realization of universal adherence to the Treaty and placement of nuclear facilities under full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. That position runs contrary to those States’ commitments and obligations as parties to the Treaty and the outcomes of the Review Conferences.

Egypt’s delegation also expresses its deep concern that certain delegations’ negative positions will have repercussions on the chances of success of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. The Conference is in fact facing considerable challenges, as explained by the Egyptian delegation in our statement at the start of the First Committee’s work during this session of the General Assembly.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30, entitled “Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, the delegation of Egypt, while supporting the purposes and objectives set forth in the draft resolution as well as many portions of the text dealing with nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, believes that it is very important that the draft resolution reflect all elements of the global non-proliferation regime: the NPT, the resolutions and decisions on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference, the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference, the obligations assumed by the nuclear-weapon States

pursuant to article VI of the Treaty and the 13 practical steps for nuclear disarmament.

Similarly, the Egyptian delegation believes that the language in operative paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30 runs counter to the consensus achieved in the Conference on Disarmament and at the 2000 Review Conference, as reflected in the Review Conference's Final Document, which notes the necessity of negotiating an international treaty banning the production of fissile material — a fissile material cut-off treaty — consistent with the Shannon mandate and aimed at attaining the objectives of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Such a treaty should be effectively verifiable.

Moreover, my delegation believes that paragraph 13 does not adequately reflect the legal reality of the IAEA comprehensive safeguards regime, which depends on attaching high priority to its universality.

The delegation of Egypt looks forward in the coming period to strengthening its coordination with the delegation of Japan in order to enhance the NPT by reinforcing the elements of nuclear disarmament that are set forth in draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30.

We would like to congratulate the Chairman of the first session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2010 NPT Review Conference, Ambassador Yukiya Amano of Japan, on his efforts and wisdom, which led to success in the Preparatory Committee's work.

**Ms. Leong** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, as a State party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), voted in favour of this draft resolution, pursuant to its commitment to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and its belief that multilateral nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation efforts should be conducted simultaneously under United Nations auspices, with a view to the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Venezuela considers that the existence of nuclear weapons is threat to the survival of humankind and that the only real guarantee against the use or the threat of

use of such weapons is their total elimination. Hence, our country advocates that no new nuclear weapons be developed and that existing weapons of this kind be destroyed. We are convinced that the most effective way of achieving a nuclear-weapon-free world is for all States, without exception, to accede to multilateral agreements negotiated on this issue and to respect and implement their provisions.

Venezuela calls for no efforts to be spared to achieve the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the prompt entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. In this connection, we repeat that the nuclear-weapon States should take the 13 practical steps adopted in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. It is essential that they provide non-nuclear-weapon States such as mine with effective guarantees on the non-use and non-threat of use of such weapons. International peace and security should not be based on privileges and discrimination, since a peace based on those elements is inherently fragile.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): I now invite members to turn to revision 1 of informal working paper no. 1, and to move on to cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction". I give the floor to the representative of India.

**Mr. Prasad** (India): On behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.22, entitled "Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction", I would like to propose two technical revisions to operative paragraph 2. The first is to delete the word "all", since some States have already signed and ratified the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. The second revision, to the same paragraph, is that the words "signing and ratifying" should be replaced with the words "accession and ratification of". The revised paragraph would thus read as follows:

"Appeals to Member States to consider early accession and ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism."

That change has been necessitated because the treaty was open for signature until 31 December 2006 and has since already entered into force, and States now have the option of acceding to and ratifying it.

We hope that, as in preceding years, the draft resolution on this subject will be adopted without a vote.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): As no delegation wishes to make a general statement, we shall proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.7\*. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.7\*, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Poland at the 15th meeting, held on 23 October 2007. The sponsor of the draft resolution is named in document A/C.1/62/L.7\*.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The sponsor of the draft resolution has 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.1/62/L.7\* was adopted.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.22. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.22, entitled "Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction", was introduced by the representative of India at the 15th meeting, held on 23 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.22 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.1, Add.2 and Add.3. In addition, the United States of America has become a sponsor.

The representative of India has just made an oral revision to paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.22. I shall read out that paragraph, as orally revised:

"Appeals to Member States to consider early accession and ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism."

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no

objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.22, as orally revised, was adopted.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): I shall now call on the representative of Pakistan, who wishes to speak in explanation of position on one of the draft resolutions just adopted.

**Mr. Khalilullah** (Pakistan): I have taken the floor to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.22, entitled "Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction".

We support the objective of the draft resolution, although we continue to believe that its language could have been improved to convey a more objective reflection of reality. The fear that terrorists and non-State actors might acquire and use weapons of mass destruction (WMD) is a recent phenomenon. However, that danger must be viewed in perspective. Terrorist organizations or non-State actors are more likely to acquire and use chemical and biological weapons capabilities. The acquisition and use of nuclear weapons by terrorists and non-State actors is much less likely. This concern should not become an excuse for discrimination against selected countries. The international community must not, however, lower its guard to prevent the possible development and use of "dirty bombs". Increased international cooperation, including the initiation of negotiations on a radiological weapons convention, should be given serious consideration.

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

We agree with the widely held view that the best guarantee against the threat of the possible use of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons is in their



elimination. Faithful implementation of existing treaty regimes, such as that of the Chemical Weapons Convention, can effectively address most of these threats. The early disarmament of chemical stocks would enhance the level of confidence against the likelihood of their acquisition and use by terrorists. However, as long as the process of chemical-weapons disarmament proceeds at a slow pace and as long as huge quantities of chemical weapons exist, the possibility of these weapons falling into terrorists' hands will remain as well.

The control of biological weapons should be of more concern, particularly to the industrially advanced States, owing to their extensive use of biological agents. The Biological Weapons Convention should therefore be strengthened, in particular by reviving the biological weapons verification protocol on which negotiations were held eight years ago. We are convinced that a revival of that process would fully serve the goal of promoting international peace and security as well as address the concerns expressed, for example, in this draft resolution.

We are convinced that a comprehensive strategy must be developed to prevent the possibility of terrorists gaining access to WMDs, which must include depriving terrorist organizations of their operational and organizational capabilities; strengthening the relevant existing multilateral regimes; negotiating a universal treaty to fill the gaps in current international instruments; augmenting States' capacity to implement global treaty obligations; and addressing the root causes of terrorism. A distinction must be maintained between counter-terrorism and non-proliferation.

This draft resolution quite appropriately mentions the Final Document of the fourteenth Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement as having expressed itself on the issue of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism. We would like to recall that in the context of the issue of terrorism the same document also stresses the need to address the causes that sometimes lead to terrorism, causes that lie in oppression, injustice and deprivation.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): I now invite the Committee to move on to cluster 3, "Outer space (disarmament aspects)". As no delegation wishes to make a general statement, I call on the representative of Brazil, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

**Mr. Denot Medeiros** (Brazil): I would like to take this opportunity to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.34, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". Over the years, Brazil has constructively engaged in the pursuit of formulas within the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva that could have paved the way for the reinitiation of substantive work in that negotiating forum. In fact, over the past 10 years, we have fully supported several proposals presented to that end in the Conference on Disarmament, the last of which was the well-known proposal of the six Presidents of the 2007 session. We believe that this proposal provides an adequate framework to initiate substantive discussions on the main items of the agenda, which could well lead to the negotiation of possible international instruments, including on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, which is the precise objective of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.34.

We deeply regret the continuation of the stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament. We therefore encourage the States that have not yet been able to join the consensus on the six Presidents' proposal to continue consultations in Geneva and elsewhere with a view to allowing the Conference to adopt a programme of work as soon as possible and to start doing what it was created to do, namely the negotiation of international instruments on disarmament.

Moreover, Brazil believes that it is vital to prevent the weaponization of outer space and to ensure the safe use of this last frontier for the benefit of all mankind. For all of those reasons, Brazil will gladly vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.34.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.34. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.34, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 13th meeting, on 22 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.34 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.1. In addition, Ecuador has become a sponsor 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, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, 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, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, 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, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Israel

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.34 was adopted by 170 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

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

**Mr. Pereira Gomes** (Portugal): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.34, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, and the European Free Trade Association country Norway, member of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia, align themselves with this declaration.

All EU member States voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.34. The EU recognizes that an arms race in outer space must be prevented, given the international community's increased involvement in space-based activities aiming at global development and progress. We do however consider that the draft resolution's references to and invitation to the Conference on Disarmament in the eleventh and seventeenth preambular paragraphs and in operative paragraph 6, with the references to an Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms race in Outer space, do not take into account the recent developments witnessed in that forum, namely the consultative structure and the substantive discussions that have taken place during the first part of this year's session on all items on the Conference on Disarmament agenda, namely a presidential draft decision on the programme of work, document CD/2007/L.1, and two further documents, CD/2007/CRP.5 and CD/2007/CRP.6, which make no reference to the establishment of ad hoc committees on any agenda item, but which came very close to consensus in the Conference on Disarmament. Those three documents have fostered our hope that the stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament may finally be overcome.

The EU remains open as to the procedural format under which substantive work on the prevention of an arms race in outer space will be undertaken in the Conference on Disarmament. But the EU would like to

have seen the draft resolution supporting the work by the membership of the Conference on Disarmament and its efforts this year to come closer to resuming substantive discussions on this issue.

**Mr. Tarui** (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.34, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". Addressing the issue of how to deal with the prevention of an arms race in outer space in the Conference on Disarmament should be without prejudice to, and be based on the result of, the ongoing discussions in the Conference on Disarmament.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): I would ask the Committee to turn to cluster 4, entitled "Conventional weapons". As no member wishes to make a statement at this stage, the Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.5. I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.5, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them", was introduced by the representative of Mali, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Economic Community of West African States, at the 19th meeting, on 29 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.5 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.1 and Add.2.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The sponsors have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. In the absence of objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.5 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): I now invite the Committee to turn to cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security". I call on the representative of Portugal, who wishes to make a general statement in that connection.

**Mr. Pereira Gomes** (Portugal): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.48, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region". The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and

the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia, and the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia, align themselves with this declaration.

The European Union welcomes draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.48, which all its member States have sponsored and which we expect will be adopted without a vote. The EU attaches great importance to the issues of security, non-proliferation and disarmament in the Mediterranean region. As recognized by the General Assembly and as stated in the European Union Strategy against Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction adopted by the European Council in December 2003, security in Europe is closely linked to security and stability in the Mediterranean and to international peace and security.

The European Union welcomes the reference in this draft resolution to the necessity of combating terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, including the possible resort by terrorists to weapons of mass destruction.

In the context of working towards strengthening security and stability in that crucial region, the EU reiterates its satisfaction with Libya's decision to eliminate all material, equipment and programmes that lead to the production of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, together with the practical steps to implement that decision undertaken by the Libyan Government.

The European Union attaches particular importance to the goal of transforming the Mediterranean into a sea of peace, security, stability, cooperation and development. We would like to recall that the Barcelona or Euro-Mediterranean (EUROMED) process, launched in 1995 as the Mediterranean dimension of the external policy of the European Union, has made a major contribution to the establishment and development of a global partnership among the EU, its member States and Mediterranean partners. That partnership includes engagements regarding the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, disarmament, zones free of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems,

verification, conventional weapons, confidence-building measures and the fight against terrorism.

We take this opportunity to highlight a number of important events contributing to the strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region. We welcome the adoption of the Euro-Mediterranean Code of Conduct on Countering Terrorism at the EUROMED Summit held in Barcelona in November 2005 and all the steps taken since then for its implementation.

We also welcome the Euro-African Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development, held in Rabat in July 2006, and the EU-African Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development, held in Tripoli in November 2006, as opportunities for strengthening cooperation in the Mediterranean region on all aspects of migration and development, including the challenges associated with illegal immigration.

Next month, EUROMED partners will meet in Portugal at the ministerial level to hold a comprehensive, integrated and balanced discussion on issues related to migration. That upcoming EUROMED ministerial meeting on migration will be a good opportunity to underline the added value of a regional cooperation framework.

This November will also see the newly established Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean meet for the first time in Malta. This will launch a new dimension of political dialogue and understanding on Mediterranean affairs at the parliamentary level. The Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean will address, among other things, issues of common concern in order to foster and enhance further confidence among Mediterranean States so as to ensure regional security and stability and promote a culture of peace.

We welcome the fact that the eighth Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction will be held in Jordan this November.

The EU reiterates its call to all States of the Mediterranean region that have not yet done so to accede to all multilaterally negotiated, legally binding instruments in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, in order to strengthen peace and cooperation in the region.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.31. I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.31, entitled “Regional disarmament”, was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 20th meeting, on 29 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.31 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The sponsors have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. In the absence of objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to proceed accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.31 was adopted.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.42. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.42, entitled “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”, was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 20th meeting, on 29 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.42 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.2.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia,

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, 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, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

India

*Abstaining:*

Bhutan

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.42 was adopted by 167 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.48. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.48, entitled “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”, was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the 16th meeting, on 24 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.48 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.1, Add.2 and Add.3.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no

objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.48 was adopted.*

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

**Mr. Prasad** (India): My delegation has taken the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.42, entitled “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”. The draft resolution requests the Conference on Disarmament to consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control. Since India believes that the Conference, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has a vocation of negotiating disarmament instruments of global application, my delegation voted against the draft resolution.

Moreover, already in 1993, the Disarmament Commission had, by consensus, adopted guidelines and recommendations for regional disarmament. Therefore, there is no need for the Conference on Disarmament to engage itself in formulating principles on the same subject at a time when it has several other priority issues on its agenda.

We believe, furthermore, that the security concerns of States often extend beyond narrowly defined regions. Consequently, the idea of preserving a balance in defence capabilities in the regional or subregional context is both unrealistic and unacceptable to our delegation.

**Ms. Leong** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.42, entitled “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”, because we believe the importance for international peace and security of promoting general and complete disarmament and the non-proliferation of weapons, which must be addressed in a comprehensive and balanced approach that takes into account the particular security characteristics of various countries, regions and subregions.

In this connection, our country believes that conventional arms control initiatives should under no circumstances underestimate the security and defence

concerns of States in the light of their respective political, regional and subregional realities, in keeping with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, including the inherent right to self-defence.

Likewise, the right of States to determine in a free and sovereign fashion their own priorities and needs in the areas of security and defence must be respected. We also stress our firm belief that any international effort designed to strengthen cooperation in the sphere of conventional arms control must take into account the real priorities of disarmament, where weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, continue to pose the greatest threat to international peace and security.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee for an announcement.

**Mr. Sareva** (Secretary of the Committee): The delegation of France will hold open-ended consultations on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.46\*, entitled "Preventing the acquisition by terrorists of radioactive materials and sources", at 6.15 p.m. today in Conference Room A.

Secondly, a new text of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.18 has been circulated, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, to all delegations. Note that the document has not yet been formally reissued.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in French*): The Committee will meet tomorrow morning to continue its consideration of clusters 6 and 7 as set forth in revision 1 of informal paper no. 1, following which it will continue its consideration of draft resolutions set out in informal paper no. 2.

*The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.*