



General Assembly

Sixty-second session

First Committee

23rd meeting

Wednesday, 31 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 continue to take action on the remaining draft resolutions that appear in revision 1 of informal working paper No. 1, starting with those in cluster 6, “Other disarmament measures and international security”.

Does any delegation wish to make a general statement? I see none. Does any delegation wish to speak in explanation of vote or position before the vote? Again, I see none.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.12. 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.12, entitled “National legislation on transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology”, was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the 21st meeting, on 30 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in the document.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.12 was adopted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.43. 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.43, “Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context”, was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 20th meeting, on 29 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in the document and in CRP.3 and Add.1 and 3.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The sponsors have expressed the wish that their draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If there are no objections, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.43 was adopted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to delegations who wish to make a statement in explanation of position after the action taken on the draft resolutions in cluster 6.

Mr. Litavrin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to clarify our position on the question of confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context and to make some general comments.

Arms reduction, arms control and the development of confidence-building measures and

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.



voluntary exchanges of information in the regional and subregional context, with the consent of the interested States, will, of course, help strengthen regional peace and security. Unfortunately, conducting such confidence-building measures in post-conflict situations or in so-called frozen conflicts is rather difficult.

It is not that people are not of goodwill or that they do not want confidence-building measures, but very often at the foundation of those conflicts there is some kind of violence that has a long history, with casualties and suffering. To forget that and to support a confidence-building dialogue in such conditions is very complicated. I would like many delegations to try to understand this point.

It is not our wish to make accusations. With regard to Moldova's comments about the role of our country in the Transnistrian settlement, we would only note that we need to be able to cooperate and negotiate. We have good examples on this score. A few years ago, the complexities between the Russian Federation and Moldova did not prevent us from agreeing to remove from Moldova to Russia a large number of man-portable air defence systems that had been placed there in order to ensure our physical security. So as to questions of disarmament, our goodwill and common sense are obvious.

In mid-October of this year, a meeting in Vienna of representatives, mediators and observers considered the question of resuming the work of the standing committee on political questions, for a Transnistrian settlement, with the participation of the representatives of Chisinau and Tiraspol, which had not been represented since 2000. So it is encouraging that the observers and the mediators gave a positive assessment to the recent statements by the leadership of Moldova and Transnistria in favour of eliminating a number of artificial barriers to economic activity.

These examples demonstrate that we need dialogue and cooperation to resolve problems, both bilaterally and within the appropriate organizations, and not through accusations and particularly not at the First Committee of the United Nations.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now consider the group of draft resolutions in cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". I give the floor to the representative of Uruguay for a general statement.

Mr. Perazza (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): As chair of the Disarmament Commission, my delegation wishes to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.3, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission". I call to the attention of this Committee a technical revision that my delegation, as chair of the Commission, wishes to make in operative paragraph 8. We wish to change the dates when the Disarmament Commission will meet in 2008. Instead of from 14 April to 2 May, it will meet from 7 to 24 April. Therefore, in English paragraph 8 will read as follows:

(*spoke in English*)

"Requests the Disarmament Commission to meet for a period not exceeding three weeks during 2008, namely from 7 to 24 April, and to submit a substantive report to the General Assembly at its sixty-third session".

(*spoke in Spanish*)

I believe that this minor revision will not prevent delegations from reaching consensus.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): I give the floor to the representative of the United States of America for a statement of position before action is taken.

Ms. Rocca (United States of America): The United States will not participate in the Committee's action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.3, on the report of the Disarmament Commission. As we made clear in our 26 October statement on disarmament machinery (see A/C.1/62/PV.18), we are pleased with some of the Commission's recent decisions. However, it has damaged its credibility by selecting an inappropriate vice-chairman, and the conduct of last year's session does not give reason for optimism that the current study cycle will have a productive result.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): I invite the Committee to decide on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.3. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.3, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission", was introduced by the representative of Uruguay at the 18th meeting, on 26 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.3 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.3. As we have just heard, the representative of Uruguay introduced an oral revision

to operative paragraph 8, where the dates should read “from 7 to 24 April”.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The sponsors have expressed the wish that their draft resolution be adopted without being put to the vote. If there are no objections, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act in this way. It is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.3, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): I now invite the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.4. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.4, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean”, was introduced by the representative of Peru on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States at the 16th meeting, on 24 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/62/L.4.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution L.4.

Under the terms of operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.4, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General “to provide the Regional Centre with all necessary support, within existing resources, so that it may carry out its programme of activities in accordance with its mandate”.

The implementation of the request would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. The provision contained therein covers one P-5 post for the Director of the Regional Centre at Lima. The programme of activities of the Regional Centre would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.4, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

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

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

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.4 was adopted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.11*. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.11*, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”, was introduced by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic at the 17th meeting, on 25 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are indicated in A/C.1/62/L.11*.

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.11 was adopted.*

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.35. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.35, entitled “United Nations

Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific”, was introduced by the representative of Nepal at the 16th meeting, on 24 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are indicated in documents A/C.1/62/L.35 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.1, 2 and 3. In addition, Mongolia has become a sponsor.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.35.

Under the terms of operative paragraphs 5 and 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.35, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General,

“taking note of paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 49/76 D of 15 December 1994, to provide the Regional Centre with the necessary support, within existing resources, in carrying out its programme of activities”

and would request the Secretary-General

“to expedite the necessary preparations with a view to ensuring physical operation of the Regional Centre from Kathmandu within six months to enable the Centre to function effectively”.

The implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. The provision contained therein covers a P-5 post for the Director of the Regional Centre. The programme of activities of the Centre would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources.

As concerns operative paragraph 7, regarding the physical operation of the Regional Centre from Kathmandu, the Office for Disarmament Affairs is working closely with the Government of Nepal on the matter. The physical operation of the Centre from Kathmandu is being funded from extrabudgetary resources.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.35, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

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

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

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.35 was adopted.

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

Mr. Erciyes (Turkey): My delegation requested the floor to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.11*, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

Turkey has been encouraged by the structured and substantive discussions that took place in the Conference on Disarmament in 2007. A momentum has been created in that forum, and we hope that it will be possible to build upon it. Turkey, as one of the countries that will assume the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament next year, will spare no effort in order to allow the Conference to resume its negotiating role in 2008.

This year once again, the draft resolution on this topic, which has just been adopted by consensus, includes a reference to the question of expanding the membership of the Conference. As stated in the report of the Conference on Disarmament, to which this draft resolution pertains, the views of the Member States on this issue are reflected in the Conference’s verbatim

records. Turkey maintains the view that the question of expansion of the membership of the Conference is not a priority at this stage. It should be addressed on a case-by-case basis, with due consideration to the contributions of candidates to international peace and security.

For this reason, the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should not be construed as a change in Turkey's well-known position on this question.

Mr. Grinius (Canada): Canada would like to provide explanations of vote both in the context of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.3, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission" and on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.11*, "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

Canada joined the consensus on draft resolution L.3. However, I wish to note my Government's continuing disappointment with the state of the multilateral disarmament machinery of the United Nations, including the Disarmament Commission. Let us not forget the role and purpose of the Commission. It is a deliberative body, mandated to consider various problems in the disarmament and non-proliferation fields and to make recommendations thereon to the General Assembly.

We recall that the Commission has done good work in the past, for example, the 16 verification principles, guidelines for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and work on practical disarmament measures in post-conflict situations. The time for deliberative work on contemporary issues in the fields of disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation, as well as conventional weapons, is long past due. Canada calls on all Member States to work together in a spirit of flexibility and compromise to arrive at concrete recommendations at next year's final session of the current Disarmament Commission cycle.

With respect to L.11*, "Report on the Conference on Disarmament", Canada joined the consensus. At the same time, I would like to take this opportunity to note my Government's disappointment with the continuing deadlock in achieving consensus on the programme of work in the Conference on Disarmament.

In Canada's view, the draft decision L.1 that was tabled by the Six Presidents of the Conference on Disarmament for 2007 was the best chance yet to finally resume productive work in the United Nations

treaty-negotiating forum. It is deeply regrettable that three Conference members have taken a position against joining the overwhelming majority of States in favour of the draft decision. We are hopeful that further work on arriving at a consensus on the draft decision will end in success in 2008.

Our optimism, however, is tempered by the fact that here in New York this fall a consensus could not be found in our preliminary consultations on a strictly procedural draft decision that would have added the issue of the prohibition of the production of fissile material to next year's First Committee agenda. My delegation reiterates its urgent call to the Conference on Disarmament States that have opposed the adoption of draft decision L.1 to reconsider their positions and to finally end the protracted deadlock in the Conference on Disarmament.

We recently celebrated the tenth anniversary of the Ottawa Convention. Unfortunately, with respect to the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament, the ongoing lack of progress continues to be an embarrassment for all who should be seriously involved in moving the arms control agenda forward.

The Chairperson: There are no other explanations of position. The First Committee has thus concluded its work on cluster 7 of the informal working paper no. 1, revision 1.

The Committee will now take up informal working paper no. 2. Cluster 1 is entitled "Nuclear Weapons". Do any delegations wish to make a general statement?

Mr. Pereira Gomes (Portugal): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.28, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty". The Candidate Countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia, and the European Free Trade Association countries 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 Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) is an essential instrument for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, and the European

Union attaches the utmost importance to its entry into force at the earliest possible date. The EU continues to call on States, particularly Annex 2 States, to sign and ratify the Treaty without delay and without conditions.

Last year, the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the CTBT by the General Assembly reminded us all of the need to redouble our efforts to complete the outstanding ratifications that are required for the entry into force of the Treaty. Therefore, the EU conducted an extensive campaign lobbying all States that have not ratified the Treaty — the 10 Annex 2 States and 34 non-Annex 2 States — earlier this year. We will continue to actively promote the universalization of the CTBT and will encourage others to do the same, in the framework of the measures outlined in the Final Declaration of the Article XIV Conference held last September in Vienna.

In this respect, the EU would like to express its appreciation and continued support for the excellent work of Ambassador Ramaker, Special representative of the States that have ratified the Treaty, and is grateful for the generous support of his functions by the Government of the Netherlands.

The EU attaches high importance to the substantial work of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) Preparatory Commission. However, the EU is deeply concerned that the financial stability of the Organization and the collective investment by the international community in the CTBT verification regime are threatened by the failure of some States signatories to meet their commitments. We therefore urge all States signatories to meet their financial obligations in full, on time and without conditions.

In addition to fulfilling financial obligations, the EU has extended its support for the CTBTO in areas such as training, capacity-building and enhancing the performance of the global verification system.

The EU believes that a legally binding prohibition of nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions, as well as a credible verification regime, are vital. Pending the entry into force of the Treaty, we urge all States to abide by the moratorium and to refrain from any actions that are contrary to the obligations and provisions of the Treaty.

That is why the European Union fully supports the draft resolution contained in document

A/C.1/62/L.28, which has been sponsored by all European Union member States.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): I call on the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for an explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Choe Il Yong (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea strongly rejects operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.9.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea's re-entry into the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) should be considered only after all the pending issues, particularly including the cessation of hostile acts against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, have been resolved. By entering into the NPT and signing the Safeguards Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea intended to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world, including on the Korean peninsula, and to get benefits from the IAEA with regard to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

However, the NPT has been misused for executing a hostile policy against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, thus seriously jeopardizing its national interests. That constituted the main cause that compelled the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to withdraw from the NPT.

It is for that reason that my delegation has asked for a recorded vote on the draft resolution before us, and will vote against it.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): We shall now proceed to the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.9. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 6 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, 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, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, 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, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, 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, 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, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, France

Operative paragraph 6 was retained by 155 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the United Kingdom advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of retaining operative paragraph 6.]

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): We shall now proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.9 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Bhutan, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation,

Slovenia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.9 as a whole was adopted by 151 votes to 5, with 13 abstentions.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): We shall now proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.27. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the last three words of operative paragraph 6 and on operative paragraph 6 as a whole. We shall first take a separate, recorded vote on the last three words of operative paragraph 6.

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, 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, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, 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, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of

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

Against:

India, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Bhutan, France, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Myanmar, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The last three words of operative paragraph 6 were retained by 154 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a separate vote on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.27 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, 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, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, 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, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania,

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

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, France, Israel, Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Operative paragraph 6 was retained by 156 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a separate vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.27 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, 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, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, 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:

Bhutan, India, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.27 was adopted by 162 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee is invited to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.28*. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to administer the vote.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.28*, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", was introduced by the representative of New Zealand at the 11th meeting, on 18 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents L.28, A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.1 through Add.4. In addition, Portugal 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, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint 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, 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:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Colombia, India, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.28 was adopted by 166 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.*

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): I now call on representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.

Mr. Darwish (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): I offer my delegation's explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.28*, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty".

My delegation abstained from voting on this draft resolution because Syria has repeatedly affirmed and reaffirmed that a treaty as important and as sensitive as the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), and what it requires in terms of future obligations from all States, can in no way ignore the legitimate concerns of non-nuclear-weapon States, which represent the vast majority of States in the world and which have not been given any guarantees preventing the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons. Moreover, non-nuclear-weapon States are not allowed to obtain advanced technology for the peaceful use of nuclear energy in all its forms in order to accelerate the pace of development in those countries.

Important and insightful statements made about the CTBT do not fail to mention that its text does not include an obligation by nuclear-weapon States to eradicate their nuclear arsenals within a reasonable period. Nor does the text refer explicitly to the illegality of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons or affirm the desirability of achieving universality of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in order to put an end to proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects. The statements have also been in agreement that the Treaty's text bans only nuclear testing, not nuclear laboratory experiments or the qualitative development and production of new types of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, they have been in agreement that an on-site verification and inspection regime would pave the way for misuse of the data gathered through a national inspection mechanism and their use for arbitrary political purposes.

One of the strangest provisions of the Treaty's text is that it permits States parties to take measures against States not party to the Treaty — including Security Council measures under Chapter VII of the Charter — and thus to violate the sovereign right of States to decide whether or not to accede to the Treaty.

The Syrian Arab Republic regards those major shortcomings with great concern. Israel, the only State in the Middle East that possesses nuclear weapons and

all other types of weapons of mass destruction, is striving to develop those weapons both quantitatively and qualitatively and refuses to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and to subject its nuclear facilities to the safeguard controls and monitoring regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency. That impedes and jeopardizes all efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and exposes the region and the entire world to the dangers of the Israeli nuclear threat, to which there has been no international response.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.28*, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”.

As a State party to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela voted in favour of the draft resolution, on the basis of its commitment to those legal instruments and to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. In that connection, our country believes that multilateral efforts aimed at nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation must be carried out simultaneously, with United Nations influence, in order to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

While Venezuela rejects the conducting of nuclear tests, we believe that the existence of nuclear weapons is a threat to humanity’s survival and that the only real guarantee against their use or threat of use is their total elimination. That is why we support the non-development of new nuclear weapons and the destruction of existing ones.

We reiterate that nuclear-weapon States must implement the 13 practical steps contained in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT and that it is essential to provide effective guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States regarding the non-use or threat of use of such weapons.

We are convinced that the most effective way to achieve a world free from nuclear weapons is for all States, without exception, to adhere to the multilateral agreements negotiated in this area and to respect and implement the provisions set out therein. Therefore, the international community must not cease in its efforts to achieve universalization of the NPT and the prompt entry into force of the CTBT.

Mr. Khalilullah (Pakistan): I have requested the floor to explain our votes on all draft resolutions under this cluster. I shall begin with an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.9, entitled “Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of disarmament commitments”.

Pakistan supports the objectives of universal and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament. However, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole because of a number of reservations and voted against operative paragraph 6.

In 2004, my delegation appreciated the efforts of the sponsors to revise the contents of the draft resolution on this topic in order to accommodate Pakistan’s position. However, the decision by the sponsors to call for Pakistan’s accession, without conditions, to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear-weapon State left this delegation with no option but to vote against operative paragraph 6 and to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

The history and the context of nuclear testing in South Asia are clear. Pakistan was not the first to test. The nuclear test carried out in South Asia in 1974, followed by further nuclear explosions on 11 and 13 May 1998, disrupted the strategic balance in the region. Pakistan had no choice but to conduct its test to restore strategic stability.

I will now explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.27, entitled “Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas”.

Pakistan has always supported the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in accordance with arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the regions concerned. However, the call, in operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia fails to acknowledge the realities on the ground. My delegation would like to recall that Pakistan itself sought unsuccessfully to promote that objective in the region for 24 years.

The nuclear explosions in South Asia on 11 and 13 May 1998 disrupted the strategic balance in South Asia. With those explosions, the objective of creating a zone free from nuclear weapons was defeated. Pakistan also had to conduct its test to restore strategic stability. Therefore, the insertion into the draft resolution of the

reference to South Asia runs counter to the realities on the ground. Accordingly, my delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 6 and on the draft resolution as a whole, and we voted against the last three words of operative paragraph 6.

Finally, I shall explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.28*, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty".

Over the years, Pakistan has consistently supported the objectives of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). We have been voting in favour of that draft resolution in the Committee; we have voted in favour of it this year as well.

In keeping with our policy of restraint and responsibility, Pakistan has observed a unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing, which we believe is in line with the object and purpose of the CTBT. Pakistan would have liked the draft resolution appropriately to reflect the unilateral moratorium that we have been observing on further nuclear testing.

My delegation continues to believe that the objective of the call in the draft resolution for promoting signatures and ratifications leading to the CTBT's entry into force will be facilitated when major erstwhile proponents of the CTBT decide to restore their support. Acceptance of CTBT obligations on a regional basis in South Asia will also help to expedite its entry into force.

Mr. Itzhaki (Israel): Israel's signature on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) in September 1996 reflects its long-standing policy of bringing itself closer, wherever possible, to international norms on nuclear safety, security and non-proliferation.

The importance of the CTBT is especially pronounced in light of the nuclear proliferation challenges and non-compliance so evident in recent years in the Middle East. Since then, Israel has taken upon itself many other obligations to promote peace and security, such as adopting comprehensive export control legislation, supporting the International Atomic Energy Agency's codes of conduct on the security of radioactive sources and the safety of research reactors, and recently joining the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism.

Since the establishment of the Preparatory Commission of the CTBT in November 1996, Israel

has played a major part in various activities to develop all elements of the CTBT verification regime. Israel has continuously paid all its dues to the CTBT Organization (CTBTO), transfers the data from its certified seismic stations to the International Data Centre (IDC), and is participating in all training, workshops and exercise activities related to on-site inspection. That demonstrates the importance Israel attaches to the CTBT, which it views as an important contribution to enhancing international peace and security.

Israel appreciates the sizable progress made in the development of the CTBT verification regime, whose completion is a prerequisite to entry into force of the Treaty, as required by the first paragraph of article IV of the CTBT. However, there is more work to be done to complete the verification regime.

The Treaty's verification regime should be robust enough to detect non-compliance with its basic obligations, be immune to abuse and, at the same time, allow each State signatory to protect its national security interests. For Israel, completing the verification regime constitutes a major consideration for ratifying the Treaty, as well as ensuring Israel's sovereign equality status in the policymaking organs of the Treaty, including those related to the geographical region of the Middle East and South Asia and in the executive council of the future CTBTO, and adherence to and compliance with the Treaty by States in the Middle East.

Pending entry into force, we believe that the advancement of the CTBT calls for the following commitments and activities to be diligently pursued by all States.

They must, first, sustain the commitment not to carry out any nuclear-weapon test explosion, in line with the Treaty's basic obligations. Secondly, they must complete as soon as possible the CTBT's verification regime. Thirdly, they must operate, maintain and test the international monitoring system (IMS) and the IDC prior to entry into force in order to gain experience and to provide early detection capabilities. In addition, where coverage gaps of IMS stations exist, they should take temporary measures to fill those gaps, such as operation of auxiliary seismic stations as primary ones until all primary stations are effectively functioning and transferring data. Fourthly, they must maintain the technical and apolitical nature

of the Preparatory Commission's work and respect its rules and procedures. Finally, they must use the IMS and IDC capabilities, without detracting from their primary objectives as the verification instruments of the Treaty, to support tsunami warning systems in order to alert threatened populations in a timely manner and save human lives.

Mr. Maclachlan (Australia): I take the floor to give an explanation of our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.9, on which my delegation abstained.

Australia remains actively committed to the objective of nuclear disarmament. We welcome the changes made to this year's draft resolution, such as the positive reference to the Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons process, and the recognition of the vital importance of the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

However, we note that the draft resolution continues not to acknowledge the progress already made in reducing nuclear arsenals. We urge the sponsors to consider taking that progress into account in any future draft resolution.

Mr. Kumar (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.9, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

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

We voted against the draft resolution since India cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Our objections to the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT are well known. In urging India to accede to the NPT "promptly and without conditions",

the draft resolution negates the rules of customary international law as enshrined in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which provides that a State's acceptance, ratification or accession to a treaty is based on the principle of free consent.

We would also like to explain our vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/62/L.27, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas". Operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, while recognizing the well-established principle that nuclear-weapon-free zones must be established on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, does not apply that principle in calling upon States to consider proposals specifically for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. That specific proposal has no greater validity than the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world where they do not exist, such as East Asia, Western Europe or North America.

Our delegation therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and voted against the last three words of operative paragraph 6, "and South Asia", and against the paragraph as a whole.

Mr. Duncan (United Kingdom): I would like to make a statement in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.9 "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". That draft resolution contains a great deal that the United Kingdom would be happy to endorse.

The United Kingdom has called for, and will continue to call for, a reinvigorated commitment to a free world free from nuclear weapons. We have therefore chosen to move away from our past opposition to this draft resolution. However, we remain unable to actively support the text as a whole, because it gives little or no recognition to the nuclear disarmament achievements of most nuclear-weapon States since the end of the cold war.

The total number of warheads in the world has been cut by something of the order of two thirds. For instance, the United Kingdom's latest cuts will result in a 75 per cent reduction in the explosive power of our weapons. By 2012, the United States' operationally deployed strategic nuclear warheads will be reduced to about one third of 2001 levels. Under the terms of the Moscow Treaty, the Russian Federation is making

parallel cuts and France has withdrawn four complete weapons systems.

In calling for urgent progress and accelerated implementation of disarmament commitments, this draft resolution conveys the impression that little or nothing has been done. The truth, as I have indicated, is very different. We do agree with the drafters that more progress is required if we are to achieve our shared vision of a nuclear-weapon-free world. The draft resolution helpfully lists several of the greatest challenges: the universalization of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the attempted withdrawal from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons by one State party. But a balanced text would also highlight the greatest challenge to nuclear disarmament today: the revelation of clandestine nuclear programmes and the failure of one country to adhere to successive Security Council resolutions.

It is for those reasons that the United Kingdom chose to abstain on this draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain the position of my delegation regarding the draft resolution on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), A/C.1/62/L.28*.

The Islamic Republic of Iran, on the basis of its strong desire to ban comprehensively any kind of nuclear test, voted in favour of the resolution. The principal objective of the Treaty is to terminate fully and comprehensively the further qualitative and quantitative development of nuclear weapons. That objective was reaffirmed by nuclear-weapon States at the time of the conclusion of the CTBT. It should be borne in mind that only by strictly observing that stated objective can the CTBT be considered as a meaningful step in the realization of a systematic process to achieve nuclear disarmament.

A decade after the adoption of the Treaty by the General Assembly, it is the time to ask ourselves whether we have achieved a comprehensive ban and been able to freeze the qualitative development of nuclear weapons, or whether the modernization and development of new types of nuclear weapons are being continued.

Given the nuclear posture and doctrines of certain nuclear-weapon States and the development of nuclear weapons outside the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, particularly in the Middle East, the situation is, regrettably, not promising. Some nuclear-weapon States, in particular the one that voted against draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.28* today, have decided to modernize and upgrade qualitatively their nuclear weapons to ensure so-called nuclear deterrence for decades to come. Those decisions are not only in contravention with the letter and spirit of the CTBT, but have called into question the vision of systematic and progressive nuclear disarmament.

In the meantime, the same country is trying to convert the provisional status of the Preparatory Commission for the CTBT Organization to a permanent status, beyond the provisions of the Treaty, in order to avoid its ratification and legally binding obligations. That gives room for nuclear-weapon States to continue to develop and even test nuclear weapons, including by super-computers or at the laboratory level. Therefore, such attempts should be opposed. In that regard, my delegation hopes the goodwill of the supporters of the CTBT will not be misused.

Accordingly, my delegation believes the current draft resolution could be improved to meet the stated concerns. We look forward to engaging constructively in the future with the sponsors of the resolution to improve the text.

Mr. Roa Arboleda (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): As at previous sessions of the First Committee, at the current session my delegation is again compelled to abstain on the draft resolution on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty in A/C.1/62/L.28*. The Provisional Technical Secretariat of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) Organization and its Preparatory Commission are aware of the constitutional limitations that have not permitted Colombia to become a State party to the CTBT. Our arguments on the matter have been made public in a clear and transparent manner during the past few years.

Colombia would like to once again reiterate today its indisputable commitment to the spirit and letter of the Treaty and its willingness to propose solutions aimed at overcoming the constitutional obstacles that exclusively concern the issue of the contributions to the Preparatory Commission prior to the ratification of

the instrument. My delegation hopes that those considerations will make possible a prompt solution to this problem so as to permit Colombia to ratify the Treaty as soon as possible, as it intends to do.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): This Committee has voted on draft resolutions A/C.1/62/L.9, L.30 and L.40, three traditional draft resolutions on nuclear disarmament. I wish to explain China's position in the voting, which is in keeping with China's fundamental position on nuclear disarmament.

China has always stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. In our view, continuing the efforts to promote the process of nuclear disarmament is of great significance for eliminating the threat of nuclear weapons at an early date, improving the international security environment and maintaining world peace. In view of that, China endorses the purposes and major content of those draft resolutions on promoting nuclear disarmament to move towards a nuclear-weapon-free world at an early date.

We also believe that the content of draft resolutions A/C.1/62/L.9, A/C.1/62/L.30 and A/C.1/62/L.40 still require further improvement. In view of the fact that the measures contained in draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.30 are not feasible or realistic in the current circumstances, we abstained in the voting.

Mr. Dobelle (France) (*spoke in French*): I take the floor to speak on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom and France on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.27, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas".

We should like to emphasize the importance we attach to nuclear-weapon-free zones, which can make a significant contribution to regional and global security if they are supported by all States of the region concerned and by the nuclear-weapon States parties; if they are subject to the appropriate treaties, including general guarantees provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency; and if they are concluded in a satisfactory manner, in consultation with the nuclear-weapon States, as called for under the 1999 guidelines of the Disarmament Commission. In that regard, we would recall that we are prepared to resume consultations with interested States parties to treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in order to achieve a mutually satisfactory outcome for pending questions.

However, with respect to the draft resolution in question, we continue to believe that it is contradictory simultaneously to propose the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone that would be largely composed of the high seas, while asserting that it would be entirely compatible with the principles and rules of international law on the freedom of navigation on the high seas and rights of passage through maritime areas, especially those covered by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

We must therefore ask ourselves whether the true objective of the draft resolution is to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone covering the high seas. We do not believe that this ambiguity has been sufficiently clarified. We therefore voted against the draft resolution this year.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): I call on the representative of the Sudan.

Mr. Hassan (Sudan): My delegation has asked to speak at this stage not in explanation of vote but on a minor procedural matter. Our delegation would like to be listed as a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/62/L.7, A/C.1/62/L.21, A/C.1/62/L.23, A/C.1/62/L.26 and A/C.1/62/L.40, which have already been adopted by the Committee. We would like to see that reflected in the record of this meeting.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): Due note has been taken of the statement made by the representative of the Sudan, which will be reflected in the record of the meeting.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Secretariat has taken due note of the statement just made by the representative of the Sudan. We will take due note of that statement in terms of joining the list of sponsors after action has already been taken or the adoption of a draft resolution or decision.

From the legal point of view, once the decision has been taken, that adopted draft resolution or decision has fallen under the ownership of the Committee, but in the practice of the General Assembly Member States do express their political support for resolutions or decisions that have already been adopted. The statement just made by the representative of the Sudan will be duly reflected in the verbatim records of the General Assembly as political support. It has been duly noted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): We have thus concluded our consideration of draft resolutions under cluster 1, as contained in informal working paper No. 2.

I would now draw the Committee's attention to cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction".

I call on the representative of Hungary.

Mr. Horváth (Hungary): On behalf of the delegation of Hungary, I should like to take this opportunity to introduce an oral revision to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.37, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction".

According to the revision, the last eight words of the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution will be deleted, and the paragraph in its new formulation will read as follows:

"Welcoming also the successful outcome of the Sixth Review Conference, which adopted a Final Document after a gap of ten years, 5 conducted a consensus article-by-article review of the operation of the Convention, reached decisions on the continuity of the intersessional meetings of experts and States parties,".

With that oral revision, my delegation moves the draft resolution for adoption by consensus and without a vote. At the same time, the delegation of Hungary wishes to express its gratitude to all those delegations that showed flexibility in the drafting of the draft resolution.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.37. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.37, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the 15th meeting, on 23 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/62/L.37.

The representative of Hungary has just introduced oral revisions to the fifth preambular paragraph of L.37 by which the word "and" will be inserted before

"reached decisions" and the phrase "and decided to establish an Implementation Support Unit" at the end of the paragraph would be deleted. The revised paragraph would therefore read as follows:

"Welcoming also the successful outcome of the Sixth Review Conference, which adopted a Final Document after a gap of ten years, conducted a consensus article-by-article review of the operation of the Convention and reached decisions on the continuity of the intersessional meetings of experts and States parties".

With the permission of the Chairperson, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompanies draft resolution L.37.

Under the terms of operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.37, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General

"to continue to render the necessary assistance to the depositary Governments of the Convention and to provide such services as may be required for the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Review Conferences, including all assistance to the annual meetings of the States parties and the meetings of experts".

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

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

Accordingly, adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.37 would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 and the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The sponsors have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to proceed in this way.

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.37, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee has concluded cluster 2. We will now begin cluster 3, on outer space. I give the floor to the representative of Cuba for a general statement.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): An arms race in outer space would entail serious dangers for international peace and security. For that reason, Cuba believes it relevant and necessary to continue to develop international measures for transparency and confidence-building with respect to outer space. That would contribute to the prevention of an arms race in space and to the promotion of international cooperation. By concrete measures, like prior notification, verification and follow-up, greater transparency and predictability in space activities would be achieved.

At the same time, Cuba believes that the Conference on Disarmament must play the principal role in negotiating a multilateral agreement on the prevention of an arms race in outer space in all its aspects.

Our country fully supports draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.41, entitled “Transparency measures and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”. Given the merits of this draft resolution, Cuba is one of its sponsors.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): I now call on the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.41. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.41, entitled “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”, was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 13th meeting, on 22 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents L.41 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and Add.1, Add.2 and Add.4 thereto.

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, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, 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, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Israel

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.41 was adopted by 168 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

[Subsequently, the delegations of China, Iceland and Niger advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The First Committee has thus concluded its work on cluster 3 of the informal working paper no. 2 and will now take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 4, “Conventional Weapons”.

I wish to announce that there has been a request to delay the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38/Rev.1. The Committee will thus examine and vote on this draft resolution at a later time.

If no delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the vote, the Committee will proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.32. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.32, entitled “Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects”, was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 21st meeting, on 30 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/62/L.32 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3 and its Add.1, 2, 3 and 4.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I will now read out, for the record, the oral statement of the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution L.32.

Under the terms of operative paragraphs 11 and 12 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General

“to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the Ninth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II to the Convention to be held on 6 November 2007, for the First Conference of the States Parties to Protocol V to be held 5 November 2007, and for the Meeting of the

States Parties to the Convention to be held from 7 to 13 November 2007, as well as for any possible continuation of work after the Meetings, should the States parties deem it appropriate”.

The Assembly would also request

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

The Secretary-General wishes to draw the attention of Member States to the fact that the respective cost estimates for servicing the three meetings of the States parties to be held on 5 and 6 and from 7 to 13 November 2007 have been prepared by the secretariats and approved by the Eighth Annual Conference of the States Parties to Amended Protocol II, held in Geneva on 6 November 2006, by the Preparatory Committee for the First Conference of the States Parties to Protocol V, held in Geneva on 18 June 2007, and by the third review conference of the States Parties to the Convention, held in Geneva from 7 to 17 November 2006.

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

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

Following established practice, the Secretariat will provide cost estimates for any possible continuation of the work after the conference for the approval of the States parties. It is recalled that all

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

Accordingly, adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.32 would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.32 was adopted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.39. 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.39, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 21st meeting, on 30 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are indicated in the document.

With the permission of the Chairperson — and, I might add, the indulgence of the Committee — I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution L.39.

Under the terms of operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request

"the Secretary-General, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 2, of the Convention, to undertake the preparations necessary to convene the next meeting of the States parties and, pending a decision to be taken at the eighth meeting of States parties, and on behalf of the States parties and in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention, to invite States not parties to the Convention, as well as the

United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations to attend the ninth meeting of the States parties as observers".

In accordance with article 14 of the Convention, the costs of the next meeting of States parties would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in that meeting, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately. The Secretariat will prepare cost estimates for the next meeting for the approval of States parties.

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

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.39 would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.39 was adopted by 154 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

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

Mr. Marrakchi (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): My delegation wishes to make the following statement in explanation of its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.39, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

First of all, the Moroccan delegation thanks the Australian delegation for having once again submitted the draft resolution on the implementation of the Ottawa Convention. The Moroccan delegation welcomes the adoption of this resolution and stresses the significant majority supporting it. That is a new

positive signal regarding the Convention, including on the part of States not yet parties. Indeed, the number of parties to the Convention — 155 — and today's favourable vote show that the platform of adherence to the spirit of the Ottawa Convention and support for its humanitarian objectives is larger than just the circle of countries that have formally signed or ratified it. That is an encouraging sign for the completion of its universalization.

Although to date we are not a party to the Ottawa Convention, for imperative and legitimate reasons of national security, Morocco voted in favour of the draft resolution again this year. We have thus continued our practice established over the past several sessions, thereby reaffirming our attachment to the objectives of the Ottawa Convention.

It must be emphasized that the Kingdom of Morocco implements *de facto* many important provisions of the Convention. Thus, Morocco does not produce, transfer or export anti-personnel mines. Likewise, we no longer import such weapons, not having done so since well before the Convention's entry into force. Moreover, Morocco, which expresses its commitment to support the Convention's review process, has submitted a voluntary report on measures taken at the national level in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Ottawa Convention.

Finally, we must emphasize that in 2002 the Kingdom of Morocco ratified Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, on mines, booby-traps and other devices, which is considered by the international community to be an essential instrument of international humanitarian law. Our accession to Amended Protocol II is further evidence of Morocco's resolve to contribute to the fight against the scourge of anti-personnel mines.

Mr. Goh (Singapore): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.39, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Singapore's position on anti-personnel mines has been clear and open. Singapore supports and will continue to support all initiatives against the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines, especially when they are directed at innocent and defenceless civilians. With that in mind, Singapore

declared a two-year moratorium in May 1996 on the export of anti-personnel landmines without self-neutralizing mechanisms. In February 1998, Singapore expanded the moratorium to include all manner of anti-personnel landmines, not just those without self-neutralizing mechanisms, and extended the moratorium indefinitely.

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

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

Mr. Ben-Shaban (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.39, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”.

My delegation abstained from voting on this draft resolution, although we are convinced of the noble humanitarian objectives of the Convention. In our view, the Convention falls short of responding to several concerns that have made my country refuse to accede to it. One of our major concerns is that the Convention does not address the issue of the historical implantation of mines in several countries, including Libya, by countries that fought in the First and Second World Wars. Those old mines have led to the inability of the countries of implantation to use for development large mine-infested areas in their territories. The Convention dealt with neither the responsibilities of the countries that planted those mines, nor the issue of compensation for the implantation countries.

My country currently participates in the meetings of the State parties to the Convention as an observer. It hopes that our concerns, which have been voiced repeatedly, will be taken into consideration and will be included in the Convention so that we can accede to it in the future.

Mr. Khalilullah (Pakistan): I have asked for the floor to explain our decision to abstain on the draft resolution entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”.

Landmines continue to play a significant role in the defence needs of many States, especially in those in regions of conflicts and dispute. Pakistan remains committed to the pursuit of the objectives of a universal and non-discriminatory ban on anti-personnel mines in a manner that takes into account the legitimate defence requirements of States.

Given our security compulsions and the need to guard our long borders not protected by any natural obstacle, the use of landmines forms an important part of our self-defence strategy. Therefore, it is not possible for Pakistan to agree to the demands for the complete prohibition of anti-personnel landmines until such time that viable alternatives are available. The objective of total elimination of anti-personnel mines can best be promoted by, *inter alia*, making available non-lethal, militarily effective and cost-effective strategies.

Pakistan is a party to the Amended Protocol II of the Certain Conventional Weapons Convention, which regulates the use of landmines in both internal and external conflicts to prevent civilians from falling victim to landmines. We continue to implement the Protocol with the greatest earnestness. With the adoption of Protocol V, on explosive remnants of war, efforts are under way for its ratification.

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

Ms. Park Ji-won (Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.39, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling,

Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”.

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

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

Nevertheless, we are no less committed than the States parties to the Convention to mitigating the suffering caused by anti-personnel mines. Since 1993, the Republic of Korea has contributed \$1.4 million through relevant United Nations mine-action programmes such as the Thematic Trust Fund of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Clearance and the United Nations Development Group Iraq Trust Fund. Our annual contribution has continued to increase year by year, reaching \$300,000 in 2007.

The Republic of Korea has also exercised tight control over anti-personnel landmines, faithfully enforcing an indefinite extension of the moratorium on their export. In addition, we have responded regularly to the annual questionnaire of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, providing all relevant information on the Republic of Korea's policy and activities regarding landmines, including anti-personnel landmines.

Furthermore, we have joined the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its Amended Protocol II, under which we are actively participating in a range of discussions and activities to ensure only a limited and responsible use of landmines, based on a prudent balance between military necessity and humanitarian concerns. We are also working earnestly towards accession to Protocol V, on explosive remnants of war, and soon we will finalize our necessary domestic procedures.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As on previous occasions, the delegation of Cuba abstained in the voting on the draft resolution

contained in document A/C.1/62/L.39, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”.

Cuba fully agrees with the legitimate humanitarian concerns associated with the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines. Our country is a State party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, including its Amended Protocol II, and strictly complies with the prohibitions and restrictions with regard to the use of mines established by the latter. Furthermore, on 17 October 2007, Cuba deposited its instrument of acceptance with regard to the amendment of article 1 of the Convention. Our country now considers itself obligated under that amendment and commits itself to observe and implement its provisions.

At the same time, it is well known that, for more than 47 years Cuba has been subjected to a policy of continuous hostility and aggression by a military superpower. As a result, our country cannot renounce the use of those types of weapons in order to preserve its sovereignty and territorial integrity, in accordance with the right to legitimate self-defence recognized in the Charter of the United Nations.

We will continue to fully support all efforts that, while maintaining the necessary balance between humanitarian matters and national security, are aimed at eliminating the terrible effects on civilians and many countries' economies of the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel landmines.

Mr. Kumar (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.39, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”.

India supports the vision of a world free of the threat of anti-personnel landmines. Since the Nairobi Review Conference, India has participated in all the meetings of the States parties. India has ratified Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. Since 1997, it has discontinued the production of non-detectable anti-personnel mines and has observed a moratorium on their transfer.

India remains committed to increased international cooperation and assistance for mine

clearance and the rehabilitation of mine victims and is willing to contribute technical assistance and expertise to that end. India has organized camps in Afghanistan for providing prosthetics to the victims of landmines in Afghanistan.

The availability of militarily effective alternative technologies that can perform, cost-effectively, the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines will considerably facilitate the goal of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines. India supports the approach enshrined in Amended Protocol II that addresses the legitimate defence requirements of States, especially those with long land borders. That is why India is not party to the Mine Ban Convention and has abstained on the resolution on the subject.

Mr. Zinsou (Benin) (*spoke in French*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.39 just adopted, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”. We voted for it because we are a State party, but we also had a particular reason for voting for that draft resolution. My delegation is very sensitive to the scope of the challenge presented by that type of weapon to the physical integrity of people living in the affected countries.

We are pleased with the renewed commitment on the part of the international community to proceed to the complete elimination of arsenals. Benin fully assumes its obligations and provides a concrete contribution to mobilizing efforts against anti-personnel mines.

In that regard, we have, with much-appreciated assistance from France, established a centre for training in post-conflict mine clearance operations and in cleaning up pollution, which opened in Ouida in the spring of 2003. That national school, which has a regional scope, allows all African countries to benefit from proven expertise in the area of mine clearance. Benin has thus placed itself at the forefront of the fight against anti-personnel mines in Africa. My delegation launches a pressing appeal to the international community, in particular the donor community, asking them to contribute to developing the activities and sphere of influence of the centre in order to achieve a world free from anti-personnel mines.

Mr. Aung Lynn (Myanmar): Myanmar abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.39, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”. Myanmar is not an exporter of, does not transfer and is against the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines. Myanmar is not a party to the Ottawa Convention, but it does respect the actions taken by the States that are party to the Convention. The use of landmines is for our national defence and is strictly under control in our country.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): With the exception of the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38/Rev.1, which has been deferred until a later date, the Committee has concluded its consideration of draft resolutions under cluster 4.

The Committee will now move on to cluster 6, “Other disarmament measures and international security”.

Are there any statements of a general nature? I see none. Does any delegation wish to explain its vote before we vote? Apparently not.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.33, entitled “Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures”. 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.33, entitled “Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures”, was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 20th meeting, on 29 October 2007. The sponsors of the draft resolution are indicated in documents A/C.1/62/L.33 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3/Add.4.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution L.33. I apologize in advance for the length of the oral statement.

Under the terms of operative paragraphs 5 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.33, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, within available resources,

(a) “To continue the practice of sending an annual note verbale to Member States requesting the submission of data to the United Nations system for the standardized reporting of military expenditures, together with the reporting format and related instructions, and to publish in a timely fashion in appropriate United Nations media the due date for transmitting data on military expenditures;

(b) “To circulate annually the reports on military expenditures as received from Member States;

(c) “To establish a group of governmental experts, on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to review the operation and further development of the Standardized Instrument for Reporting Military Expenditures, commencing in 2010, taking into account the views expressed by Member States on the subject and the reports of the Secretary-General on objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures, and to transmit the report of the group of experts to the General Assembly for consideration at its sixty-sixth session;

(d) “To continue consultations with relevant international bodies, with a view to ascertaining requirements for adjusting the present instrument, with a view to encouraging wider participation, and to make recommendations, based on the outcome of those consultations and taking into account the views of Member States, on necessary changes to the content and structure of the standardized reporting system;

(e) “To encourage relevant international bodies and organizations to promote transparency of military expenditures and to consult with those bodies and organizations with emphasis on examining possibilities for enhancing complementarity among international and regional reporting systems and for exchanging related information between those bodies and the United Nations;

(f) “To encourage the United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament in Africa, in Asia and the Pacific, and in Latin America and the Caribbean to assist Member

States in their regions in enhancing their knowledge of the standardized reporting system;

(g) “To promote international and regional/subregional symposiums and training seminars to explain the purpose of the standardized reporting system and to give relevant technical instructions;

(h) “To report on experiences gained during such symposiums and training seminars.”

Implementation of the requests contained in operative paragraphs 5 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

Pursuant to the request contained in operative paragraph 5 (c) of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the group of governmental experts would hold three sessions, one in Geneva and two in New York, during the biennium 2010-2011. Should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.33, total full costs of conference servicing and facilities, travel of experts and the costs of consultants for the substantive servicing of the three sessions of the group envisaged under this draft resolution, would amount to \$1,169,800, at current rates, in the biennium 2010-2011, as follows: under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management”, \$624,500; under section 4, “Disarmament”, \$504,400; under section 28E, “Administration, Geneva”, \$3,400; and, under section 28D, “Office of Central Support Services”, \$37,500 — totalling, as already indicated, \$1,169,800.

These requirements would be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011. Accordingly, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 and the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

Finally, the attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section 6 of General Assembly 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory

Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

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

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.33 was adopted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.47. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.47, entitled “Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification”, was submitted by the representative of Canada. The sponsors of the draft resolution are indicated in documents L.47 and A/C.1/62/CRP.3/Add.2 through 4. In addition, Spain has become a sponsor.

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.47 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. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation wishes to explain its position on A/C.1/62/L.33, entitled “Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures”, which was just adopted without a vote. As in previous years, the Cuban delegation joined the consensus on this text. At the same time, I would like to indicate that, as we said to the sponsors, Cuba does

not think it is entirely justified to have a new governmental working group to review the functioning of the standardized instrument for reporting on military action.

As we have said on previous occasions, we are concerned by the growing trend to establish groups of experts under the First Committee. Cuba believes that creating expert groups cannot be the rule, but rather the exception. Priority must be given to open and transparent discussions and negotiations, in which all Member States have the opportunity to participate under equal conditions.

Expert groups, such as that created under this resolution, are very costly and take up much of the financial resources allocated to the Office of Disarmament Affairs, which could have been devoted to other priorities. The secretariat has just announced that, in the specific case of this group of experts, this would exceed \$1,600,000. But what is of even more concern is the very limited composition of these groups, in which experts of only a few countries participate while the rest of the Member States remain completely outside of what is discussed and decided there. The Cuban delegation wishes to emphasize the fact that any possible recommendations considered in 2010 by this expert group must not in any way change the voluntary character of the standardized instrument.

My delegation also wishes to explain its position with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.47, entitled “Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification”. Cuba joined the consensus on this text once its sponsors incorporated in the original text important proposals that were submitted by various delegations, including that of Cuba. Our country will study the report submitted by the governmental expert group under General Assembly resolution 59/60 and, in due time, will give its opinion on it.

Given that that report was only recently issued, it would be premature for our country to make any judgements on the recommendations contained therein. On the other hand, we have understood, in accordance with operative paragraph 2 of this resolution, in which the Secretary-General is requested to give the report of the group of experts the widest possible circulation, that this will not have additional financial implications.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of the Bolivarian

Republic of Venezuela, as in previous years, joined the consensus in adopting draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.33, entitled "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures", because we believe it is a positive initiative among the set of confidence-building measures in the area of disarmament.

However, our country wishes to express its point of view with regard to the new group of governmental experts that will start its work in 2010. We believe that it is important that the functioning of the standardized instrument for the voluntary submission of reports be non-discriminatory and balanced. We think it is necessary to identify and consider the political and security measures that have prevented almost two thirds of the Members States of the Organization from participating in the system for the standardization of reports and heeding the calls for the submission of reports.

Furthermore, Venezuela believes that the group of governmental experts should treat this subject in a balanced way and include relevant variables in expenditures by militarily important States aimed at the investigation and development of new technologies in the area of strategic weapons whose variables have a negative effect on the security of other countries. All of this generates vertical proliferation that is not subject to any type of monitoring or international verification.

The Venezuelan delegation hopes that the group of governmental experts, in compliance with the mandate entrusted to it, will take into account this concern so that the system for the standardization of reports on military expenditures will be based on objective and non-discriminatory criteria and can then be a useful tool for confidence-building in the framework of promoting general and complete disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Khalilullah (Pakistan): I am taking the floor to explain our position on the draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.47, entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification".

While, in a spirit of cooperation, we decided in 2004 to go along with the draft resolution that established the panel of governmental experts, we were not convinced then, nor are we convinced now, that any panel of experts with limited representation could make a significant contribution to the philosophy of

verification. To lend greater legitimacy and wider acceptance among Member States, we hope that adequate representation of all relevant countries will be ensured in any future work on this important issue.

We continue to believe that verification is essential in promoting confidence among States in compliance with disarmament treaties and agreements to which they are parties. Verification ensures the effectiveness and integrity of such agreements. However, the concept and practice of verification are integral to arms limitation and disarmament agreements. Verification has no independent existence, and concepts related to verification cannot be promoted in a vacuum.

Major disarmament initiatives since the verification principles were agreed upon have suffered setbacks. The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the Biological Weapons Convention Protocol are cases in point. It is not for want of knowledge in the field of verification that these initiatives have been side-lined, but rather for political reasons. Verification was a goal for the fissile material cut-off treaty and now, non-verification is a new objective. Changing goal posts would erode the confidence of States and the effectiveness and integrity of multilateral treaties.

The Chairperson (*spoke in French*): The First Committee has thus concluded its consideration and adopting of resolutions of cluster 6, except for draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38/Rev.1, which we will return to under informal working paper no. 3, which the secretariat has just issued and circulated. I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee for an announcement.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): First of all, regarding informal working paper no. 3, which is before members of the Committee, we will issue a revision to reflect two draft resolutions. First, A/C.1/62/L.16 should actually appear under cluster 6 and not cluster 5, in accordance with A/C.1/62/CRP.4/Rev.1. Secondly, unfortunately, we do not as yet have the oral statement for A/C.1/62/L.52/Rev.1, which means that L.52/Rev.1 will be reflected in informal working paper no. 4, listing the draft resolutions that the Committee will take up on Friday. We will issue a revised informal paper no. 3 to reflect those changes.

An oral statement on A/C.1/62/L.45 is ready and is available for pick-up on the 29th floor. That is on the list for tomorrow in informal paper no. 3.

I am happy to announce that A/C.1/62/L.18/Rev.1 is now available in the documents pool in all languages.

There will be a meeting of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.38/Rev.1, entitled "Prevention of the illicit transfer and unauthorized access to and use of man-portable air defence systems", immediately following the conclusion of this meeting.

Mr. Ruddyard (Indonesia): I apologize for taking the floor at this very late hour, but I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to a slight mistake in informal paper no. 3, under cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery", with regard to document A/C.1/62/L.17, "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". It is a resolution, not a decision. I hope the secretariat can make the necessary adjustment.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.