



# General Assembly

Sixty-fourth session

First Committee

**23**<sup>rd</sup> meeting

Monday, 2 November 2009, 10 a.m.  
New York

Official Records

*Chairperson:* Mr. José Luis Cancela . . . . . (Uruguay)

*The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.*

## Agenda items 86 to 103 (continued)

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

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on those speakers remaining on our list from last week who wish to take the floor in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1.

**Mr. Wang Chang** (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China supports appropriate steps by the international community to regulate the arms trade and, in particular, to combat the illicit traffic in weapons. China believes that the primary purpose of an arms trade treaty should be to maintain global and regional stability while ensuring countries' right to self-defence and to meet their security needs. Such a treaty should therefore be universal, objective and non-discriminatory.

From the current discussions in the Open-ended Working Group towards an Arms Trade Treaty, it seems that there are still considerable differences among the parties when it comes to the goals, purposes, scope of application, related principles and other elements of a treaty. Resolving those issues will not be possible without the full participation of the main arms-trading countries. We support step-by-step efforts by the parties concerned in the context of the United Nations with a view to continuing discussions of those issues on the basis of consensus in order to achieve further agreement. Only in that way will the results of the discussions be assured of universal support and

eventual finalization. At the same time, the discussions should never undermine the status of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiations forum.

Regrettably, the draft resolution on the arms trade treaty, contained in document A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1, fails to China's concerns. In particular, it does not expressly provide that the arms trade treaty should be agreed on the basis of consensus, which certainly does not favour achieving a consensus that will culminate in a treaty with the universal participation of the major arms-trading countries. Therefore, China abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

**Mr. Matambo** (Zimbabwe): Zimbabwe takes this opportunity to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1, entitled "The arms trade treaty". Zimbabwe shares the noble ideal of having an arms trade treaty whose goal should be that of setting common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms in order to prevent the diversion of these arms to the illicit market and to non-State actors.

Zimbabwe is concerned that the promoters of the arms trade treaty have decided to initiate negotiations on the proposed treaty next year, before agreements on its goals, scope and parameters have been concluded by the Open-ended Working Group towards an Arms Trade Treaty. We would have preferred that the Open-ended Working Group continue its deliberations and allow the interests and concerns of Member States to be fully addressed. The rush to conclude a treaty by

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 U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.



2012 shows that the promoters of the arms trade treaty are not prepared to take into account the vital national interests and concerns of all Member States that are at stake in the context of such a sensitive security and defence issue. A rushed process can lead to flawed negotiations and subsequently to a problematic and less desirable treaty.

In addition, since the resolution on the arms trade treaty was first adopted by the General Assembly, there have been vigorous behind-the-scenes campaigns by civic organizations and non-governmental organizations, with the backing of certain Western Powers, to portray Zimbabwe as the leading example of why the arms trade treaty is needed. One wonders why Zimbabwe, which is a country that is not a threat to regional or global peace and security, is already being subjected to such treatment well before the treaty has even been negotiated, let alone agreed upon.

Given our experience with non-governmental organizations in the past, we object to any attempt to give them an important role to play in this very sensitive security and defence matter. For us, this is a matter for Member States only.

To us, the vicious campaign against Zimbabwe shows beyond a doubt that this treaty is likely to be highly politicized, selectively applied, discriminatory and subject to political abuse and manipulation by certain Powers to push their hidden agendas. We treat such vicious campaigns as hidden attempts by certain Western Powers to use the arms trade treaty to score cheap political points and achieve political ends against Zimbabwe, which we strongly reject.

Let me assure the Committee, however, that Zimbabwe will remain engaged in this process in the hope that its promoters will be genuine enough to make it inclusive and objective and to seek a consensual end.

**Mrs. Sánchez Quintero** (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me to offer an explanation of Cuba's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1, entitled "The arms trade treaty".

As is known, this text addresses a complex and highly sensitive issue with important political, economic, legal and security implications for States. Cuba has participated actively in the discussions that have taken place on this topic. In particular, we expressed our concerns within the Group of

Governmental Experts, where the complexity of the matter and the diversity of positions became obvious.

In fact, the Group of Governmental Experts was not able to reach a consensus on the feasibility of developing a legally binding instrument that would establish common international parameters for the export, import and transfer of conventional weapons. In other words, it is clear that the question of the transfer of conventional weapons has no easy answers and does not allow for preconceived or simplistic formulas. Despite the fact that the text that we have adopted includes important elements, such as the explicit reaffirmation of the right to self-defence of all States set forth in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, the Cuban delegation regrets the fact that the text does not faithfully reflect all of the recommendations made by the Group of Governmental Experts.

Cuba believes that any eventual legally binding instrument on the transfer of conventional arms should be negotiated on a non-discriminatory, transparent, multilateral and step-by-step basis. We do not understand the wish to force and hasten the achievement of that goal, especially when we are in the midst of a process of multilateral exchange that has highlighted the complexity of the matter.

In our opinion, we will make progress to the extent that we remain committed to building consensus and do not force or impose agreements on highly controversial pending issues by favouring the views of some at the expense of the legitimate security concerns of others. Allow me to underscore that any truly effective and universally acceptable future instrument on the transfer of arms must be achieved by consensus and necessarily enjoy the full participation of the main arms-producing and exporting States.

For Cuba, it is very important to also emphasize that the future review of this issue should be undertaken in the context of the United Nations, and specifically in a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly, which would obviate the possibility of parallel processes outside the multilateral and universal framework of the United Nations, in contrast to what, unfortunately, has too often happened with other matters.

**Mr. Poo** (Singapore): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1, entitled "The arms trade treaty".

Singapore firmly supports the establishment of an arms trade treaty aimed at developing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional weapons. We stand ready to participate actively in an open, inclusive and transparent process towards achieving a strong and robust arms trade treaty, with decisions taken on the basis of consensus.

**Mr. Charles** (Trinidad and Tobago): Trinidad and Tobago voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1 because of our commitment to upholding the rule of law in all matters concerning members of the international community.

For us, the conclusion of a strong and legally binding treaty to regulate all aspects of the trade in conventional weapons is long overdue. We in the Caribbean have witnessed the deleterious effects of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons on the social and economic fabric of our societies, which have placed an inordinate burden on the law enforcement and judicial authorities of our region.

However, Trinidad and Tobago wishes to put on record that, while we recognize the benefits of consensus in seeking to arrive at the conclusion of any international agreement, we do not construe the word “consensus”, as it is used in paragraph 5, to mean the conferring on any State or States of the power of action that is similar to a veto and could have the effect of defeating the object and purpose of the very legal instrument that we are seeking to craft.

Trinidad and Tobago will continue to work assiduously with other Member States in the sessions of the Preparatory Committee and other meetings leading up to the 2012 Conference towards a strong and effective legally binding arms trade treaty that would grant rights and impose obligations on all parties to the treaty.

**Mr. Tarar** (Pakistan): I have taken the floor to explain our abstention in the voting on the draft resolution entitled “The arms trade treaty”, contained in document A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1.

While we appreciate the fact that the text acknowledges the importance of consensus in making decisions, the fact remains that the Open-ended Working Group process has not yet yielded consensus on the elements, parameters, scope or feasibility of an arms trade treaty. Hence, jumping from the Open-

ended Working Group to a United Nations conference is not going to serve the purpose.

Moreover, the draft resolution envisages that the United Nations Conference in 2012 will agree on an arms trade treaty within four weeks. Such prejudgment of an outcome, as well as the virtual imposition of an artificial deadline, is against the spirit of the recommendation of the Group of Governmental Experts that the process be step by step, transparent, inclusive and consensual.

**Mr. Seifi Porgoo** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1, entitled “The arms trade treaty”.

As a country affected by the problem of the illicit trade in arms linked to drug trafficking and the operation of terrorist groups from outside the country, the Islamic Republic of Iran has always supported combating and eradicating the illicit arms trade. Therefore, my country has always backed initiatives on preventing such illicit trade. We are of the opinion that, in order to address effectively the negative implications arising from the illicit arms trade, it is essential to develop and maintain an integrated approach. Jumping from one plan to another or from one step to the next would only waste the resources of United Nations Members and bear no valuable results.

While the major problem of the developing countries in that regard has been the transfer of illicit small arms and light weapons, certain countries try to imply that the main problem is the illicit trade in seven categories of weapons, including warships, jet fighters, missiles, armed vehicles and tanks. In our view, the best approach to dealing with the issue of the illicit trade in weapons would be to focus on the main issues and to work constructively within the framework of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, taking into account the concerns of all.

Despite all their differences, Member States, including Iran, have constructively participated in the Open-ended Working Group towards an Arms Trade Treaty, and the first consensus report was a positive step, but the new proposal to jump to the next stage — namely, a United Nations conference — is a hasty and premature move.

Furthermore, the present draft resolution has many deficiencies, particularly in the preambular part. The draft resolution has selectively chosen certain principles of the United Nations Programme of Action, while ignoring important principles of the United Nations Charter, such as the right to self-determination. Thus, this draft resolution is not balanced and cannot be a basis for any possible instrument.

Given the aforementioned concerns, my delegation abstained in the voting on this draft resolution.

**Mr. Malme** (Norway): My delegation takes the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1, entitled "The arms trade treaty".

Norway voted in favour of the draft resolution on the basis of our commitment to and support for a strong legally binding arms trade treaty. It is of the utmost importance that the negotiations result in an arms trade treaty that effectively regulates the trade in all conventional weapons. That is vital in order to achieve a relevant arms trade treaty that makes a real difference on the ground. In our view, an arms trade treaty must include strong provisions on international humanitarian law and human rights, and obligations regarding cooperation and assistance, including recognizing the need to support victims.

We are encouraged by the increased interest in and support for starting negotiations on the part of the Member States, and welcome their public commitment to achieving a strong and robust arms trade treaty. In partnership with other States, we will engage constructively both in the preparatory process and at the United Nations Conference in 2012. We encourage the involvement of civil society and relevant United Nations field organizations in the arms trade treaty process. An open and transparent process requires the active participation and critical involvement of civil society.

Paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1 refers to the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty being "undertaken in an open and transparent manner, on the basis of consensus, to achieve a strong and robust treaty". We are concerned that the requirement of consensus could negatively affect the negotiations and reduce the quality of the outcome. Deciding that all States have the right to veto and to block the end result from the outset of the

negotiating process will seriously undermine the credibility of the process.

In conclusion, we believe that every effort should be made to reach general agreement on matters of substance. Broad support strengthens the end result and will be important for the efficient implementation of a future arms trade treaty. However, we are of the view that paragraph 5, as drafted, should not be interpreted as imposing the requirement that decisions be made only on the basis of consensus.

**Mr. Belaoura** (Algeria) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the end of last week, the delegation of Algeria voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1 on the basis of our belief that its adoption would serve the goals to which we all aspire to promote international peace and security and to establish a framework regulating this sensitive activity, namely, the arms trade.

Also, my delegation would like to commend the constructive and positive spirit that prevailed in the negotiations on the draft resolution and the flexibility and constructive attitude demonstrated by the sponsors in taking into account the concerns of other delegations on this extremely important issue.

We believe that, as outlined in the draft resolution, converting the Working Group into a preparatory committee for the proposed conference, to be held in 2012 with a view to concluding an arms trade treaty, is an important positive development arising from the progress made by the Working Group at the past session and from the widespread support for that process in general.

Algeria's commitment to concluding a strong treaty that addresses the import, export and transfer of conventional weapons is a principled stance that we demonstrated in the work of the Working Group, during the discussions on the draft resolution, and in activities related to promoting that treaty as a whole.

In conclusion, we would also like to stress that there is a need for transparency, inclusiveness and in particular consensus on decision-taking in our forthcoming discussions, as set out in the draft resolution, so as to ensure the treaty's true universality and the broadest participation of Member States in a future treaty.

**Mr. Hamza** (United Republic of Tanzania): I thank you very much, Mr. Chairperson, for giving me

the opportunity to explain my delegation's vote on the draft resolution entitled "The arms trade treaty", contained in document A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1, under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

The United Republic of Tanzania would like to see an arms trade treaty reached sooner rather than later. The unregulated trade in conventional weapons, including small arms and light weapons, has caused great economic and political misery, as well as a great loss of innocent lives, including those of women and children, worldwide, and especially in the countries of the Great Lakes region and the Horn of Africa.

In consideration of that, we wish to encourage every Member State to negotiate towards that goal with utmost urgency. My delegation is convinced that negotiations towards eventual binding instruments on regulating the trade and circulation of conventional weapons, including small arms and light weapons, as well as their illicit proliferation, should continue without impediment in the multilateral framework of the United Nations.

We voted in favour of the draft resolution because, unlike past versions, it has the potential to bring together more parties in the negotiations and to yield the required results. We also supported it in the hope that all negotiating parties will continue to participate and strive to reach an arms trade treaty that enjoys the support of all Member States. We therefore particularly urge all weapon-producing States to negotiate honestly and to demonstrate continuously the goodwill and patience that they showed in supporting this draft resolution.

**Mr. Hermoso** (Philippines): I am taking the floor to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1 on the arms trade treaty.

The Philippines firmly believes in the objectives of a future legally binding arms trade treaty; hence its vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1. However, the Philippines is concerned about paragraph 5 of the resolution, specifically the language on consensus. Indeed, every effort should be made to arrive at consensus, especially in a treaty of such importance as the arms trade treaty. But consensus should not be used to delay or prevent the negotiation and adoption of a future arms trade treaty. While consensus is an ideal to be wished for or desired, at no time must it be resorted to in order to defeat a very noble objective. In a very real sense, a consensus

requirement permits the exercise of what may amount to a veto power. In a working participatory democracy, consensus may become an undemocratic exercise.

**Mr. Conlon** (Austria): My delegation takes the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1, entitled "The arms trade treaty". We fully support the statement made by the representative of Sweden on behalf of the European Union.

Austria voted in favour of the draft resolution on the basis of its long-established support for the negotiation of a meaningful, legally binding arms trade treaty that would make a real difference on the ground. We are pleased that the draft resolution has been adopted with an overwhelming majority, and in this context we thank the authors for their efforts.

With regard to paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, we share most of the concerns expressed by delegations that have spoken previously. At the same time, my delegation is guided by the need for a strong and robust treaty, and we appeal to all States to shoulder their responsibilities so that we can jointly reach this goal. In this spirit, we look forward to cooperating with partners in the preparatory process and at the Conference in 2012.

**Mr. van den IJssel** (Netherlands): I wish to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1. Of course, the Netherlands associates itself fully with the statement made earlier by the representative of Sweden on behalf of the European Union before the vote.

The Netherlands very much welcomes the adoption of this important draft resolution. The adoption enables the start of a negotiating process that should lead to a strong and robust arms trade treaty in 2012, establishing the highest possible standards to be respected in the trade of conventional arms. It is exactly because we want the treaty to meet these high standards that we have expressed concerns about the strict application of the consensus rule at the Conference in 2012. We do not want an outcome that is determined by the lowest common denominator, but rather a result that reflects the urgency and the gravity of the problems that we want to address.

As a fervent supporter of an arms trade treaty, we have decided to give our full support to the draft. We are committed to working with the sponsors and all

other States to establish a strong and robust treaty with the highest possible standards, including on human rights and on international humanitarian law. We want to work closely with the sponsors and others in a process in which the focus is on what should be included and not on what we want to exclude, and on a substantive debate and not on creating procedural obstacles to avoid having such a debate.

In order to make the process we embark on as of now a success, we will continue to need to the strong interest and cooperation of civil society. We count on its members to help us also by telling us sometimes unwelcome truths, so that we will be able to conclude a real, meaningful treaty in 2012.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now consider the draft resolutions listed in revision 1 of informal paper 4 under cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”.

I call on the representative of Chile to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1.

**Mr. Del Campo** (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): In its capacity as coordinator of the focal points on nuclear-weapon-free zones, Chile this year is introducing on their behalf the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1, entitled “Second Conference of States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia”. The draft resolution enjoys the sponsorship of a significant number of countries. We are grateful for that support.

As determined supporters of multilateralism, States parties and signatories of treaties that establish nuclear-weapon-free zones believe that in the current international environment, the United Nations is the most appropriate forum and framework to organize the Second Conference of those States, for there is a close link between the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime and the establishment and development of new nuclear-weapon-free zones. Such zones are important tools in preventing nuclear proliferation and reducing the chances that nuclear weapons will be used. They are also useful in strengthening peace at the regional and international levels and in creating an environment of trust that is conducive to achieving the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons.

The draft resolution is procedural in nature. Its main objective is to garner the necessary support for

the holding of the Conference. With a view towards achieving consensus and in a spirit of flexibility, we endeavoured as much as possible to accommodate the positions and requests of various delegations. We did so while consistently maintaining focus on the goal to which I have referred, namely, the holding at the United Nations of the second Conference of States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia on 30 April 2010, immediately prior to the Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

We regret that, at the request of one delegation, a recorded vote is to be taken on the draft resolution. We would of course have preferred its adoption by consensus. We call on the sponsors and on all delegations that support us in connection with the goals to which I have referred to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

The draft resolution is based on broad consensus, which could be affected were the amendment that has been proposed to the fourth preambular paragraph accepted. We therefore call on the sponsors and delegations that have supported the draft resolution to vote against the amendment. Chile has no problem with the change that has been requested, but we believe that the integrity of the original text should be preserved so as not to disrupt the balance that has been established.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on those delegations wishing to make general statements.

**Mr. Hallak** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): We stand for the lofty principles and confirm the importance of international conventions on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the world. We congratulate those States in regions that have been able to create such zones. We wish to recall in this respect that my country, Syria, on behalf of the Arab Group, introduced a draft resolution to the Security Council on 29 December 2003 (A/58/667, annex), which was intended to rid the Middle East region of all weapons of mass destruction, foremost among them nuclear weapons.

With respect to the amendment proposed to the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1, we have strong reservations for the following reasons. First, the title of the draft resolution refers to regions that have established

nuclear-weapon-free zones. It is no secret that the Middle East region remains the only exception to this rule because of Israel's nuclear arsenal and its rejection of the creation of such a zone.

Secondly, the reference to the Middle East contained in the revision to draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46 is related to the provisions of the Final Document of the special session on disarmament (resolution S-10/2) and to the principles adopted by the Disarmament Commission in 1999 concerning the replacement of the 1995 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as a reference point by rules that are not binding on Israel.

Thirdly, every year the First Committee adopts two draft resolutions on the Middle East, one on the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, and the other on the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. Consequently, including a reference to the Middle East using ambiguous language that does not reflect realities in the region would actually promote confusion regarding the two draft resolutions. In addition, the inclusion of certain references serves to undermine the progress made at Vienna and New York in connection with the foundations for establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

**Mr. Aly** (Egypt): I take the floor this morning to deliver a general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.55, which was introduced by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

At this session of the First Committee, the importance of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East has been repeatedly highlighted and collectively supported by the Committee in several draft resolutions, including in particular the consensus draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.3, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", which was introduced by my delegation; draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.4, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", which was introduced on behalf of the Arab Group; and, of course, the New Agenda Coalition draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.54 entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". Those draft resolutions acknowledged the importance of the establishment of such zones, in particular in the Middle East.

The draft resolution entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East" also makes a direct reference to the United Nations agreed guidelines on the establishment of such zones by referring, in paragraph 5, to the tenth special session of the General Assembly. The Final Document of the tenth special session unambiguously acknowledges the need for "agreements freely arrived at among States of the zones concerned" (*resolution S-10/2, para. 33*). That is clearly in accordance with the first session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the 1999 guidelines of the Disarmament Commission, which were adopted under Egypt's chairmanship.

As a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1, which was introduced by the representative of Chile, Egypt strongly supports the fourth preambular paragraph as it stands, as it most correctly and objectively reflects the priorities already identified by the Committee with regard to the Middle East nuclear-weapon-free zone in agreed language and in a manner most consistent with Egypt's approach to this issue. That agreed language has also been consistently used in other forums, including most recently in the final document of the Organization of the Islamic Conference's ministerial meeting held here in New York in September under the chairmanship of Syria.

For those reasons, Egypt will oppose the amendment proposed by the Syrian Arab Republic in order to maintain the existing reference in the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1. That is dictated by considerations of consistency in the position of Egypt with regard to this most important issue.

**Mr. Seifi Porgoo** (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation supports the amendment proposed by the Syrian Arab Republic, contained in document A/C.1/64/L.55.

**Mr. Choe Il Yong** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation supports the Syrian proposal, contained in document A/C.1/64/L.55, to amend draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1.

**The Chairperson:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. The Committee will first take action on the amendment to the draft resolution contained in

document A/C.1/64/L.55, on which a recorded vote has also been requested.

I give the floor to the representative of Germany on a point of order.

**Mr. Hoffmann** (Germany): The representative of Chile, the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1, says that he would have preferred that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. I checked the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and read in rule 90 the following sentence: "If one or more amendments are adopted, the amended proposal shall then be voted upon". In my understanding, that means that if an amendment is not adopted, one need not necessarily have a vote on a proposal. I raise this point because the Chairperson announced that he plans to hold a vote on the resolution as a whole. I would suggest that that should be taken up once the amendment (A/C.1/64/L.55) has been voted upon, because I do not think that there is a necessity to actually have a recorded vote on the draft resolution as a whole if the amendment is not adopted.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in Spanish*): Indeed, the interpretation of that rule that has been brought to our attention by the representative of Germany is correct. However, the Chair must inform the Committee that a delegation has requested a vote on the draft resolution as a whole, so we have no other option than to proceed with a vote on that draft resolution as a whole.

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

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1, entitled "Second Conference of States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia", was introduced by the representative of Chile at the 23rd meeting, on 2 November 2009. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1 and A/C.1/64/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Uzbekistan has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I shall now read out for the record an oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1.

In connection with the draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1, entitled "Second Conference of States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish

Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia", I wish to put on record the following statement on the financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

Under the terms of paragraphs 1 and 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1, the General Assembly would decide to convene the second Conference of States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia in New York on 30 April 2010, and request the Secretary-General to provide the necessary assistance and services as may be required for the second Conference of States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia.

Pursuant to the request contained in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, it is the understanding of the Secretary-General that Secretariat assistance and substantive support services to the second Conference of the States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia would be required for its implementation.

The conference servicing costs for two plenary meetings of the second Conference of the States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia in New York are estimated at \$225,700. In addition, non-conference servicing requirements for general temporary assistance, overtime, communications and miscellaneous expenses are estimated at \$20,000.

In accordance with established procedure, the United Nations would levy a charge at a rate of 13 per cent of expenditure for such activities to defray the administrative and other support costs incurred in their implementation. Such expenses are estimated at \$32,000. Furthermore, in accordance with established policies and procedures of the United Nations, a provision corresponding to 15 per cent of the estimated costs of the meeting would have to be made for the contingency reserve to cover eventual shortfalls of the final expenditures. That would amount to \$36,900.

All costs related to the second Conference of the States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia shall be met in accordance with the arrangements made by the parties to the treaties. The request that the Secretary-General render the necessary assistance and provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the second Conference of the States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish



Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia, should thus have no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations.

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

In summary, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1 would not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

The Committee will now vote on the amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1 contained in document A/C.1/64/L.55.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Syrian Arab Republic.

*Against:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United

Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia.

*Abstaining:*

Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Congo, Ethiopia, Guyana, Haiti, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Nepal, Saint Lucia, Serbia, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, United Republic of Tanzania.

*The amendment contained in document A/C.1/64/L.55 was rejected by 103 votes to 4, with 22 abstentions.*

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1 is entitled "Second Conference of States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia".

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar,

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

*Against:*

None.

*Abstaining:*

France, Israel, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1 was adopted by 159 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

**The Chairperson:** I now give the floor to speakers who wish to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

**Mr. Shcherbak** (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1.

The Russian delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution. We fully support the aspirations for cooperation among States parties and signatories of treaties that establish nuclear-weapon-free zones and Mongolia. Our position of principle in favour of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zone is reflected in our vote on a number of draft resolutions in the First Committee. Russia has recognized Mongolia's non-nuclear status in the framework of a bilateral treaty.

At the same time, we draw attention to references in draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1 to specific paragraphs from documents produced through negotiations in which Russia did not participate. Moreover, we object to several sentences in those paragraphs. In practice, we have noted a readiness on the part of sponsors in the negotiation on other draft resolutions in the First Committee to take into consideration the concerns of States with regard to references to specific documents and resolutions that do not enjoy consensus support.

Those considerations prevented us from supporting the draft resolution.

**Mr. Shepherd** (United Kingdom): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1, I am speaking on behalf of the United Kingdom, France and the United States. We wish to clarify the reasons for which we abstained in the voting.

The Security Council noted its support for the convening of the Conference in question in its resolution 1887 (2009). We are confident that it can make a useful contribution to the field of nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. The policy of the United Kingdom, France and the United States towards nuclear-weapon-free zones was set out in our explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.31 on a nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas. In that context, we would like to make clear that we do not endorse all the treaties listed in the second preambular paragraph, pending such outcomes; nor can we give an unqualified endorsement of paragraph 122 of the Final Document of the fifteenth summit of the Non-Aligned Movement (see A/63/965, annex), which was held at Sharm el-Sheikh in July 2009.

We would nonetheless like to thank the authors and sponsors of the draft resolution for their flexibility in accepting a number of changes to it, and in particular for their clarification that the Conference will not represent a new call on United Nations financial resources and their acknowledgement of some of the conditions necessary for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

**Mr. Hallak** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): As I indicated in my general remarks, my delegation supports measures to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones throughout the world in order to achieve a world free of weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons.

I have requested the floor to place on record the fact that our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1 was due to our rejection of the new language in the fourth preambular paragraph and of the practice of replacing international disarmament agreements with bilateral agreements.

**Mr. Yaroshevich** (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): Belarus voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1 because we believe it to be

comprehensive and universal in nature. The draft resolution covers all regions of the world, including the Middle East. In addition, Belarus supports the convening, in New York on 30 April 2010, of the second Conference of States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia.

In conclusion, I must say that we also agree with the arguments made by delegations that abstained in the voting on the draft resolution. On the whole, we believe that, if possible, we should remove elements from draft resolutions that make it impossible to adopt it by consensus. That is especially valid when we are dealing with procedural draft resolutions such as A/C.1/64/L.46/Rev.1.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee has thus concluded its action on all draft resolutions submitted under disarmament and international security agenda items.

## Agenda item 118

### Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in Spanish*): I should now like to draw the Committee's attention to document A/C.1/64/CRP.3, which contains the proposed programme of work and timetable for the Committee's next session, which has just been distributed. As members are aware, following the adoption of the relevant drafts in connection with all draft resolutions and decisions, we must review agenda item 118, on the revitalization of the work of the General Assembly.

I would like to make some brief observations on the draft programme of work and timetable contained in document A/C.1/64/CRP.3, which has already been reviewed by the Bureau. The draft programme has been put together after consultations with the Chair of the Fourth Committee. It has been agreed that the First and Fourth Committees shall begin their work in the first week of October, as has always been done in the past, in a sequential manner. However, the Fourth Committee has agreed to allow our Committee to meet in the morning and in the afternoon on Monday, 18 October, and Friday, 29 October. The total number of meetings will be the same as the number in this session. In light of the experience of this session, however, I propose to allocate one additional meeting to the general debate and one less to the thematic

discussion. As for this year, the deadline for submission of all draft resolutions and decisions would be the Thursday of the second week.

If there are no objections, may I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft programme of work and timetable for its next session, as contained in document A/C.1/64/CRP.3?

*It was so decided.*

### Statement by the Chairperson

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in Spanish*): I would now like to make some brief remarks.

On behalf of my Government, let me reiterate what an honour it has been for the Government of Uruguay and for me personally to have been able to conduct the work of the First Committee at this session. I wish to express particular appreciation to each and every delegation for their tireless cooperation and constructive spirit, evidenced during the past four weeks of intense work. I am certain that none of the results that we have been able to achieve at this sixty-fourth session would have been possible without the support of every Member State and of the various regional groups, which from the outset expressed their full commitment and willingness to maintain the positive atmosphere that has prevailed in recent months in our work on disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control.

Since the beginning of the work of this Committee, representatives have heard me say that my main goal for this session was to attain the greatest possible consensus among all delegations — not consensus based on minimal points of agreement that lead to more or less recycled formulas of scant content, or imposed by majorities over minorities or the powerful over the weak. Rather, I have sought consensus as a cornerstone of genuinely constructive efforts that have allowed the First Committee to maintain and advance the unprecedented momentum that the discussion on disarmament and non-proliferation is currently enjoying; a consensus on contributing to the overarching goal that is shared by all delegations and civil society and transcends legitimate and respectable national and regional interests: a world free of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction. That is a great commitment and a great responsibility for us all.

On the first day of our work, I indicated that, despite differences in approaches and stances, I would try to increase the number of draft resolutions adopted by consensus in order to demonstrate that the impulse to strengthen multilateralism had found its true embodiment in the resolutions and decisions of the First Committee. After four weeks of intense work, I wish to congratulate all delegations on their efforts to polish and position that aforementioned cornerstone. The sixty-fourth session saw the adoption of 50 draft resolutions and four draft decisions. Twenty-one of those were adopted by a recorded vote, and 33 by consensus. This shows that, happily, we have increased the number of draft resolutions adopted by consensus.

At the same time, and with members' permission, I should like to point to the proven progress that has been made on some of the important draft resolutions on our working agenda. This includes the draft resolution on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (A/C.1/64/L.47/Rev.1), which, for the first time, enjoyed the favourable votes and co-sponsorship of the five nuclear-weapon States. It is my hope that we will step up our efforts to ensure that this draft resolution achieves even greater consensus in future First Committee sessions.

I also wish to underscore the importance of the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution urging the Conference on Disarmament to agree in early 2010 on a programme of work providing for the start of negotiations on a treaty to ban the production of fissile material for the manufacture of nuclear weapons or other explosive nuclear devices (A/C.1/64/L.1/Rev.1).

Regardless of the positions taken by the different delegations, I believe that this is the moment to call attention to a concrete achievement of our work — our adoption on Friday morning of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1, in which we decided to convene in 2012 the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty in order to draft a legally binding instrument on the highest possible common international standards for the transfer of conventional weapons. This represents three specific contributions made by the First Committee in the areas of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. In other words, the work of the First Committee at this session will act as a decisive boost to the important work of the Conference on Disarmament and the 2010 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In that

context, I call on all States to do their utmost to ensure that we achieve truly landmark historic progress in the world of disarmament and non-proliferation.

I cannot fail in my remarks to underscore and express appreciation for the excellent working atmosphere in the First Committee Bureau. The members of the Bureau have given their full cooperation and availability. I therefore wish to publicly thank the Vice-Chairs, Ambassadors Hilario Davide of the Philippines, Hossam Aly of Egypt and Florian Laudi of Germany, and our Rapporteur Tetyana Pokhval'ona of Ukraine for their support.

I also express my most sincere appreciation to the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ambassador Sergio Duarte. I thank him for the constant support and good suggestions he has offered me since my election in July, which I highly appreciate and value. I also express special appreciation and recognition to all the Secretariat staff who, under the efficient direction of Mr. Timur Alasaniya, have supported our every action. In my personal opinion, the current session of the First Committee has been notable for its efficient organization thanks to the strong support of Mr. Alasaniya's team throughout these four weeks.

I also express my sincere appreciation to all the interpreters and translators, and in particular the translators into Spanish, for their assistance in preparing my notes. I also thank the verbatim reporters, press officers, document officers, conference officers and the sound engineers who have worked diligently behind the scenes to support the work of the First Committee.

My appreciation also goes to the Non-Aligned Movement once again for its constructive and active efforts not only in New York, but also in Geneva when consultations were held in August. My thanks also go to the countries of the European Union for their support, the States members of the Western European and Others Group, the Group of Eastern European States, the Group of African States, the Group of Asian States and the various subregional groupings that, through their statements and submission of draft resolutions, have made our work dynamic.

Allow me again to thank my regional group, the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, for having trusted in me to lead the work of the First

Committee and for their demonstrations of tireless support for our work.

Last but not least, I thank the non-governmental organizations for their ongoing availability and for clarifying the vision of civil society in the work of the First Committee.

As I indicated at the beginning of this session, the Committee will meet again in May or June of the coming year to elect the Chairperson of the sixty-fifth session.

**Mr. Ruddyard** (Indonesia): On behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), I am honoured to take the floor one more time to thank you, Sir, and your Bureau, as well as the Secretariat staff, for their valuable support and cooperation extended to our group during this session of the Committee.

NAM appreciates your leadership, Sir, in chairing the Committee. That delegations were able to emerge from these instances with determination intact to advance the global agenda on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, on other weapons of mass destruction, on conventional weapons and on other related issues and with continued high respect for each other is in no small measure due to your very able leadership and deft stewardship of this Committee. Allow me to also extend our appreciation to all member States for their cooperation during the meetings of the Committee.

NAM assures its continued cooperation with and support to all of those pursuing the agreed international agenda on disarmament and non-proliferation, and hopes to see a world with security, peace and prosperity for all, sooner rather than later.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the representative of Indonesia for the kind words addressed to the Chairperson and other members of the Bureau.

**Mr. Obisakin** (Nigeria) (*spoke in French*): I take the floor on behalf of the African Group to thank you, Sir, for all you have done for us throughout this session.

(*spoke in English*)

On behalf of the African Group, I thank you very much for your understanding and perseverance. We are aware that the work is not easy. You have been there. You have felt it. You have seen it. You have stayed the

course, in spite of the untoward winds. And we are arriving. Africa appreciates you and your team of able-bodied men and women who have worked through several sleepless nights.

It is true that we have not always smiled at each other from this side. In my place, we have a saying that when five siblings go into a room to speak truthfully to each other and they come out smiling, it means that they have not told the truth. But when they come out looking sober and serious, that means that they are making progress.

We are grateful to you, Sir. We have seen the mirror that reflects what is before it — the state of the world and the mosaic of interests. But like all mosaics, they form a whole. We can see beauty in spite of differences. I have said it here before: If we look carefully at each other's hair — whether it is the golden hair of someone from a Nordic country or the black hair of an African — at the end, if we live long enough, we all end up with gray hair.

The world is one. Whether the discussion turns to nuclear war, nuclear-weapon-free zones, conventional weapons, disarmament, non-proliferation or anything else — peace is the word. There is a long way to go. We hope that our efforts and debates will one day lead to a safer world for those who are in the remote countries of the world and who have placed so much hope in us.

Our world still needs a great deal of broadmindedness and much more understanding. We know that it is not easy. When the hunter goes to the forest to hunt and comes back late, if we consider what he has gone through we may understand that he may not want to share the game with those at home.

We wish you all the best, Sir. Our interest in peace — we believe in Africa — should be overarching, beyond narrow national and commercial interests. We thank you from Africa.

**Mr. Sitnikov** (Russian Federation): I would like to praise you, Sir, and the Bureau for your elegant mastery and efficiency stewardship of the work of the First Committee. We convey to you our full and unadulterated admiration for the strong will you have shown by staying at the helm of the Committee meeting in, meeting out, excepting maybe for only short periods of time.

Let me extend our appreciation to the representatives of all Member States for the spirit of cooperation and flexibility they have displayed. That is reflected today in the great number of draft resolutions adopted by consensus and the small number of votes cast in opposition.

To all our colleagues returning to their capitals, Geneva or Vienna, we wish pleasant and safe travels.

Last but not least, our thanks go also to the Secretariat staff assigned to the First Committee, the Office for Disarmament Affairs and conference services personnel for their patience and understanding and for working with us in such a professional manner.

**Mr. Bodini** (San Marino): I want to congratulate you, Sir, and the Bureau of the First Committee for your outstanding work. What you showed at this session was that things can be accomplished at the United Nations. San Marino — and I am sure that it is the same with many of the small countries as well — is extremely pleased at this new trend towards the decolonization of the world and the pattern of resorting to much more effective ways of communicating among each other.

**Ms. Reyes** (Honduras) (*spoke in Spanish*): On behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, we wish to express our pride in the sterling manner in which you have conducted our work, Mr. Chairperson. We wish to express our thanks for the

leadership and diplomatic skill with which you have led us to the successful completion of our work.

**Mr. Hellgren** (Sweden): On behalf of the European Union, I just want to take this opportunity to thank you, Sir, the Bureau and the staff of the Secretariat for your able leadership and hard work throughout this year's session of the First Committee. I would also like to thank partners for the constructive deliberations over the past few weeks.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in Spanish*): I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Secretary of the Committee): I want to thank you, Sir, for your kind words and praise addressed to the Secretariat. I also want to thank delegations for making this session one of the most interesting and for making us part of the interesting discussions. We thank them for their kind cooperation and the moderate pressure that they applied on the Secretariat. I want also to thank the Bureau members for their wise counsel and direction, and you, Mr. Chairperson, above all, for the guidance and political acumen that you provided during this session.

**The Chairperson** (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee has thus concluded the main part of its session for the year 2009. I thank each and every one of you.

*The meeting rose at 12 noon.*