



General Assembly

Sixty-fourth session

First Committee

21st meeting

Thursday, 29 October 2009, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chairperson: Mr. José Luis Cancela (Uruguay)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.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*): We shall continue to take action on the draft resolutions listed in revision 1 of informal paper 2, beginning with those under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons". Once we have taken decisions on the draft resolutions under all clusters covered by the informal paper, the Committee will proceed to take decisions on the draft resolutions listed in informal paper 3, which was distributed at the end of yesterday's meeting.

Before the Committee proceeds to take decisions on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 1 in revision 1 of informal paper 2, I shall give the floor to speakers who wish to make general statements, other than explanations of vote, or to introduce draft resolutions.

I give the floor to the representative of Japan to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.36*.

Mr. Suda (Japan): I would like to say a few words on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.36*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

Japan, along with many other sponsors, has introduced a draft resolution aimed at the total elimination of nuclear weapons every year since 1994. The resolution has enjoyed increasing support at

consecutive sessions of the Committee, including the support of some nuclear-weapon States. Furthermore, over the past 15 years, the content of the resolution itself has shown steady development. This year's text has been drafted to reflect the latest developments in nuclear disarmament and to call, in a specific manner, for the further efforts we need to make.

Japan believes that the adoption of this draft resolution by an overwhelming majority would add further impetus to the strengthening of our cooperation towards the success of the Review Conference for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to be held in May 2010.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Canada to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.1/Rev.1.

Mr. Gartshore (Canada): The delegation of Canada has the pleasure to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.1/Rev.1., entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices".

This year marks the first time since 2004 that a draft resolution on this topic has been brought to action in the First Committee. In doing that this year, Canada's aim was to build upon the momentum generated in recent months for work to begin in the Conference on Disarmament on such a treaty.

Over the course of three rounds of open-ended consultations and various other bilateral meetings here in the First Committee, Canada's delegation consulted

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.

09-58357 (E)



Please recycle

widely, openly and in the spirit of compromise. Canada was pleased that other delegations responded in the same way. It appears that the international community will speak again today with one voice in support of the commencement of negotiations on this vital international instrument, which, as the draft resolution notes, would make a significant contribution to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

The Canadian delegation thanks all other delegations for their support and for the views and positions put forward during the development of the draft resolution. While document A/C.1/64/L.1/Rev.1 bears Canada's name, it most certainly reflects the work of a great many delegations in this room today and in capitals.

Mr. Choe Il Yong (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation has asked for the floor to clarify its position on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.36*, which was introduced by the delegation of Japan.

First, Security Council resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009), which are referred to in the draft resolution, were produced by an irresponsible and unfair Security Council in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. The Security Council has never taken a serious attitude in relation to the Korean issue. By calling into question even our peaceful satellite launch, the Council imperilled its legitimacy and credibility completely by itself. The second nuclear test of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was a self-defence measure to counter the action of the Security Council, which made an issue of our peaceful satellite launch after being forced by the United States.

Secondly, Japan has no qualification whatsoever to talk about the Six-Party Talks. Japan is a saboteur in the Six-Party Talks, implementing none of its own obligations agreed at the Talks and creating complicity with a totally irrelevant issue. Most recently, she acted in a craven manner with regard to our peaceful satellite launch, only to drive the Six-Party Talks to an end after all. The other parties in the Talks are well aware of that.

As for the Six-Party Talks, we have already made it clear that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is willing to participate in multiparty talks if our talks with the United States go well and the multiparty talks also include the Six-Party Talks.

Japan has denied a main thrust of the draft resolution of its own accord by mentioning the paragraph on the Korean peninsula in it. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea remains unchanged in its stand to realize the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and beyond. My delegation suggests that a vote be taken on the draft resolution. We will vote against it in its entirety.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take a decision on the draft resolutions under cluster 1. Before we do so, I shall give the floor to delegations that wish to explain their positions or votes on the draft resolutions under that cluster.

As no delegation wishes to do so, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.1/Rev.1. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.1/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", was introduced by the representative of Canada earlier in this meeting. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in the document.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee decides to proceed accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.1/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.36*. A recorded vote has been requested. 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.36*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", was introduced by the representative of Japan earlier in this meeting. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents L.36* and CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Iraq and Malawi have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.36 was adopted by 161 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of Belize, Dominica, Liberia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Paraguay, San Marino, Senegal and Sierra Leone advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position following the adoption of the draft resolutions.

Mr. Danon (France) (*spoke in French*): France welcomes the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.1/Rev.1. Today's action attests to the international support for the beginning of negotiations on a treaty to ban the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons, the so-called cut-off treaty. That support was also recently reflected in Security Council resolution 1887 (2009), an important resolution adopted during a meeting held at the level of heads of State and Government on 24 September.

For almost 15 years, France has been strongly committed to the negotiation of a cut-off treaty. Such a proposal was among the initiatives put forward by the President of the Republic in his speech at Cherbourg in March 2008. That initiative was incorporated into the European action plan for disarmament adopted in December 2008 by the European Union's 27 heads of State or Government.

For its part, France suspended all production of plutonium for its nuclear weapons in 1992. In 1996, we put in place a similar measure in connection with highly enriched uranium. That year, we were the first country to decide to close and dismantle its facilities for the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons. The dismantlement of those facilities is irreversible, as representatives of States members of the Conference on Disarmament, non-governmental experts and members of the media were able to witness for themselves during visits to facilities at Pierrelatte and Marcoule organized by France in 2008 and 2009. Today, France no longer has any installations for the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons.

France hopes that the Conference on Disarmament will be able to begin negotiations on a cut-off treaty in January on the basis of the programme of work it adopted by consensus last May. Along with its European Union partners, France now calls on all States concerned to strictly respect an immediate moratorium on the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons.

I now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.36* in order to set out the reasons for our abstention in the voting this year.

France believes this to be an important resolution, on which we have always maintained a constructive dialogue with Japan. We were pleased to support the draft resolution in 2008. Against the backdrop of the Review Conference for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) next May, it is important that the message of the draft resolution with regard to the progress made, the problems still ahead and the important milestone that is Security Council resolution 1887 (2009) be clear and complete and take full account of realities. On several points, draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.36* could have been improved.

France particularly regrets that the draft resolution gives an incomplete picture of efforts in the area of nuclear disarmament. France welcomes the decision by the two main nuclear-weapon States to reach an agreement on a successor to the Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START) before the end of the year. We therefore fully support the terms in which the draft resolution welcomes that decision. Given the size of the arsenals involved, a new agreement to reduce Russian and American offensive strategic arsenals would indeed be a major step forward.

On the other hand, we find it regrettable that there is no reference in the draft resolution to measures that have already been taken and implemented by other nuclear-weapon States — in particular by France, but also by the United Kingdom. Reference was explicitly made to them last year, as should have been done this year. Resolution 1887 (2009), which the Security Council adopted unanimously on 24 September, recognized, further, the nuclear arms reductions and disarmament efforts undertaken and accomplished by nuclear-weapon States.

Moreover, we believe that the draft resolution could have more forcibly underscored the importance of promoting a concrete approach to disarmament. Beyond speechmaking and setting out visions, genuine commitment to disarmament entails concrete actions. That is what we must build upon, in particular at the NPT Review Conference next year. As the heads of State and Government of the 15 members of the Security Council signalled in the first preambular paragraph of resolution 1887 (2009), that is how we will truly be able to

“seek a safer world for all and to create the conditions for a world without nuclear weapons, in accordance with the goals of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), in a way that promotes international stability, and based on the principle of undiminished security for all”.

Lastly, I am delighted to say that France supports the reference in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution to the increased transparency on the part of some nuclear-weapon States regarding their nuclear arsenals, including the number of their nuclear warheads. It is my pleasure to recall here that that is the case of France, whose President last year announced an absolute ceiling on our nuclear arsenal. As I also mentioned earlier, we have also organized several unprecedented visits to our former facilities for the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I should like to remind representatives that there are still another eight requests for the floor in explanation of vote. I therefore kindly ask representatives to make their statements concise and brief, so that we can effectively bring the Committee's work to a conclusion. I thank speakers in advance for their cooperation.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): Pakistan joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.1/Rev.1, in keeping with our consistent support for a non-discriminatory, multilateral, and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices that also takes into account the issue of asymmetries in stockpiles.

Our support for the draft resolution is without prejudice to our position that the Conference on Disarmament should adopt a holistic approach towards

the consideration of the whole range of issues on its agenda. Piecemeal prescriptions such those contained in document CD/1864 — which contains the work programme for this year — have not worked in the past, nor are they likely to yield positive results in the future.

In 2010, the Conference on Disarmament must adopt a balanced and comprehensive programme of work that provides for parallel substantive negotiations with equal emphasis on all four core issues on its agenda. The members of the Conference should not shy away from their responsibility to ensure that that sole disarmament negotiating forum is able to respond to growing international support for nuclear disarmament by commencing substantive negotiations on this issue.

Pakistan is opposed to a conventional or nuclear arms race in South Asia. While following a policy of restraint and responsibility, Pakistan cannot be oblivious to its national security imperatives, which necessitate the maintenance of a credible minimum deterrence in the nuclearized security environment in our region. That becomes all the more important for Pakistan against the backdrop of recent developments in our region, including the introduction of nuclear submarines, anti-ballistic missile systems and other advanced weapons systems, as well as discriminatory approaches that have negatively impacted strategic stability in South Asia.

Pakistan is of the firm belief that the objective of regional and global peace and stability can be achieved only by addressing asymmetries in the conventional and nuclear fields at the global, regional and subregional levels. The fissile material treaty should be a genuine disarmament measure, and not a limited non-proliferation instrument. As a responsible nuclear-weapon State, Pakistan is ready to work towards such a treaty that also fully takes into account our legitimate security concerns. We cannot accept any arrangement that places us in a position of strategic disadvantage.

The commencement of substantive work at the Conference on Disarmament will be facilitated in the framework to which I have referred by ensuring that the rules of procedure of the Conference, particularly the principle of consensus, are fully respected. To further the cause of global and regional peace and security, it will be essential to uphold the principle of equal and undiminished security for all States.

I would also like to take this opportunity to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.36*, entitled “Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”. My delegation does not agree with several of its provisions. The draft resolution places unequal and undue emphasis on non-proliferation rather than on nuclear disarmament. That indeed reflects regression in this vital area.

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

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): Based on Syria’s full support for the renewed determination to eliminate nuclear weapons, my country voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.36*, entitled “Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”.

However, we wish to record our reservation regarding the reference in the text to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty owing to our well-known position on that Treaty, which has been stated on several occasions, and because we believe that such a reference diverts from the draft resolution’s primary goal of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Rao (India): I have asked for the floor to explain India’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.36*, entitled “Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”.

India remains committed to the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. India also shares the view that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing. We continue to support a credible, time-bound programme for global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament.

India cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear-weapon State. India's position on the NPT is well known. There is no question of India joining the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Nuclear weapons are an integral part of India's national security and will remain so, pending non-discriminatory and global nuclear disarmament.

As India supports the commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty in the Conference on Disarmament, the question of a moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons does not arise. Our negative vote on this draft resolution does not detract from India's readiness to work with others — including with Japan, the lead sponsor of this draft resolution — to achieve global disarmament and non-proliferation objectives.

Mr. Macedo Soares (Brazil): Brazil acknowledges the importance of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.36*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", and voted in favour of it. Brazil wants to point out that the call in operative paragraph 15 for the universalization of the Model Protocol Additional to the Agreements between States and the International Atomic Energy Agency for the Application of Safeguards refers to an instrument of an essentially voluntary nature. The concept of universalization applies solely to multilateral treaties.

Mr. Li Yang (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Committee has just voted on three draft resolutions on nuclear disarmament: A/C.1/64/L.48, "Nuclear disarmament"; A/C.1/64/L.54, "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments"; and A/C.1/64/L.36*, "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to explain China's position after the vote.

China has always stood for the complete prohibition and total elimination of nuclear weapons. We believe that, to build a world of undiminished security for all, it is very important to press ahead with nuclear disarmament and to substantially reduce the threat posed by such weapons.

Based on that position, China endorses the thrust and major elements of nuclear disarmament in those three draft resolutions. At the same time, we believe that there is still room for further improvement of their content. Given that the relevant measures described in

draft resolution L.36* are not practical and viable under current circumstances, we abstained from voting on that draft resolution.

Mr. Itzhaki (Israel): I wish to give an explanation of position on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.1/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices".

Recent developments highlight the dangers posed by non-compliance by States with their international obligations and commitments and by the uncontrolled dissemination of nuclear fuel cycle capabilities. That holds especially true for the region of the Middle East, where several States have an especially poor track record of compliance with their nuclear non-proliferation obligations.

The fissile material cut-off treaty will not address those growing threats and challenges. In fact, by enhancing a State's ability to masquerade certain illegal activities, any proposal on the future cut-off treaty may curtail the efforts of the international community to address those challenges.

In that light, it is our belief that the international community must focus its efforts first and foremost on ensuring compliance with existing non-proliferation obligations, and on finding the appropriate balance between the need to answer the growing demand for nuclear energy at the global and regional levels and the need to prevent nuclear proliferation. In that regard, multilateral arrangements should be sought with regard to the field of nuclear fuel lease or takeback, credible supply assurances and the international spent fuel storage options.

Despite these views, Israel decided today to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.1/Rev.1, on a fissile material cut-off treaty.

Mr. Asayesh Talab (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation regarding draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.1/Rev.1.

We are of the firm conviction that the existence of nuclear weapons is the greatest threat to the security of all nations. Therefore, negotiation on nuclear disarmament remains the highest priority of my delegation in the work of the Conference on Disarmament. If supported, the reactivation of the Conference must be based on a balanced and

comprehensive programme of work that should be responsive to the priorities of all Member States.

A treaty that bans fissile material for nuclear weapon purposes should not be developed as a mere non-proliferation instrument. We will never accept such an approach. In that context, the scope of such a treaty should cover the past and future production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

In carrying forward the programme of work of the Conference on Disarmament, balance and equilibrium should be observed and the rules of procedure of the Conference should be fully respected.

Mrs. Ancidey (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, as a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.36*, entitled “Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”. It did so based on its position as a country with a pacifist calling and tradition, fully committed to such legal instruments and to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

In that regard, we recognize the multilateral efforts towards nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, which should take place simultaneously, under the influence of the United Nations, in order to bring about the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Nevertheless, we must state our view on the tenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution just adopted. We acknowledge that the summit referred to took place. However, the limited composition of the Security Council did not allow the rest of the delegations of this Organization to take part in the summit, which was held to address one of the issues most important to humankind and which will only find a final solution if we work with true multilateral commitment.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.40 under cluster 3.

I call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position on draft resolutions under cluster 3.

Mrs. Sánchez Quintero (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Under cluster 3, Cuba co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.25, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”, which was adopted yesterday, and draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.40, entitled “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”, on which we will take action today.

An arms race in outer space would result in serious threats to international peace and security. For that reason, Cuba believes it fitting and necessary that international transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space should continue to be developed. Cuba welcomes the aforementioned texts as a significant contribution to the efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space, which include such concrete measures as prior notification, verification and follow-up, in order to achieve greater transparency in space activities. At the same time, Cuba believes that the Conference on Disarmament must play the lead role in the negotiation of a multilateral agreement on the prevention of an arms race in outer space in all its aspects.

While draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.25 was adopted yesterday, we hope that, as in previous years, draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.40 will be adopted with the support of Member States.

Mr. Larson (United States of America): The United States will not be participating in the Committee’s action on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.40, entitled “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”.

The United States will continue to play a leading role in advancing pragmatic and voluntary transparency and confidence-building measures (TCBMs) for national security and related space activities. Earlier this year, the United States and the Russian Federation exchanged information regarding the collision of a privately operated Iridium communications satellite with an inactive Russian military satellite. As a result of these exchanges, the United States and Russia agreed to commence discussions on opportunities for new bilateral space TCBMs. The United States looks forward to further diplomatic and military-to-military exchanges with Russian experts in the coming months.

Also, over the past two years, the United States has had fruitful and forthright exchanges with

European experts regarding the European Union's proposal for a code of conduct for outer space activities. Looking ahead, the United States will continue to work with the European Union in efforts to advance a set of voluntary TCBMs that is acceptable to the greatest number of countries.

In consultation with allies, the United States is currently in the process of assessing options for international cooperation in space as a part of a comprehensive review of national space policy. This review of space cooperation options includes a blank slate analysis of the feasibility and desirability of options for TCBMs that enhance space flight safety and advance the national security interests of the United States and its allies, as well as of all spacefaring nations.

The United States looks forward to discussing insights gained from this presidential review next year before this Committee during the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly. The United States also looks forward to engaging in substantive discussions in 2010 on the agenda item on the prevention of an arms race in outer space as a part of a consensus programme of work at the Conference on Disarmament.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on A/C.1/64/L.40. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.40, entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities", was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 13th meeting, on 19 October 2009. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/64/L.40 and A/C.1/64/CRP.4/Rev.2. In addition, Burkina Faso and El Salvador have joined the list of sponsors.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): 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.1/64/L.40 was adopted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee shall now turn to the draft resolutions listed in revision 1 of informal working paper 2 under cluster 4.

I give the floor to the representative of Azerbaijan to make a general statement.

Mr. Ismayil-Zada (Azerbaijan): Azerbaijan fully supports the comprehensive ban and destruction of anti-personnel mines, and envisages a full ban and destruction of anti-personnel mines throughout the world as an impetus to global security and the welfare of the world community. Azerbaijan believes that a full ban and destruction of anti-personnel landmines is an important humanitarian objective of the world community in the twenty-first century.

The Government of Azerbaijan has supported from the outset the idea of having a comprehensive international legal document on the prohibition of the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines; shares all the concerns taken into consideration while coming to agreement on the Convention; and is involved neither in the transfer or transportation of anti-personnel mines nor in their production. Therefore, Azerbaijan also advocates mine clearance and the destruction of mines.

The Republic of Azerbaijan has not acceded to the Ottawa Convention, since our country was forced to use landmines as a measure of containment to prevent a possible resumption of hostilities. Azerbaijan has suffered from the landmine problem as a consequence of the armed conflict that has resulted in the occupation of 20 per cent of its territory. Azerbaijan cannot accede to the Ottawa Convention without a settlement of the armed conflict, the restoration of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Azerbaijan, and the removal of the threat of a resumption in hostilities, even though Azerbaijan has stopped the planting of additional mines. Therefore, our adherence to the Ottawa Convention will be possible only after a final settlement of the conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia.

Despite these difficulties, Azerbaijan follows most of the provisions of the Convention. Taking into consideration the humanitarian goals of the annual General Assembly resolution calling for the universalization of the Ottawa Convention, the Republic of Azerbaijan has demonstrated its will to support the global endeavour to make the world free from the menace of mines by voting in favour of the resolution. As a sign of our real dedication to and support for the Ottawa process, since 2008 Azerbaijan

has taken the voluntary initiative of submitting a report pursuant to article 7 of the Convention.

Currently, the Republic of Azerbaijan is actively cooperating with humanitarian demining institutions, such as United Nations agencies, international organizations, non-governmental organizations and private companies, as well as on a bilateral basis, in order to develop its national capacities in mine clearance and related activities. At the same time, in accordance with article 6 of the Ottawa Convention, it is providing assistance to other countries. In particular, it helps Georgia and Afghanistan in developing their national capacities.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions under cluster 4.

I give the floor to delegations that wish to make statements in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions under cluster 4.

Mrs. Sánchez Quintero (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As at previous sessions, the Cuban delegation will abstain in the voting 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”, which this year appears in document A/C.1/64/L.53.

Cuba fully shares the legitimate humanitarian concerns regarding the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines. Our country is a State party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, including its Protocol II, and fully complies with the prohibitions and restrictions on the use of mines set out in the Convention.

As we have noted on previous occasions, Cuba has suffered for over 50 years under a policy of continuous hostility and aggression on the part of the military super-Power. As a result, our country is not in a position to renounce the use of mines to preserve its sovereignty and territorial integrity in accordance with the right to legitimate self-defence recognized in the United Nations Charter.

Cuba will continue to support all efforts to maintain the necessary balance between humanitarian issues and national security concerns that are aimed at eliminating the terrible effects of the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines on the

civilian population and the economy of many countries.

Furthermore, we join the appeal to all States that are in a position to do so to provide the necessary financial, technical and humanitarian assistance for demining operations and for the social and economic rehabilitation of their victims.

Mr. Ochoa (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to make a statement in explanation of position on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.42/Rev.1, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”. Mexico will support the draft resolution. However, we believe that it is only through openness and the inclusion of the points of view of all Member States that we will be able to confront the serious threat of the illegal traffic in arms. We would like the omnibus resolution to contain, in the future, more substantive elements and to reflect the legitimate concerns of all delegations.

Ms. Mourabit (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): I wish to speak in explanation of my country’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.53, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”.

Morocco, which actively contributed to the preparatory process for the Convention, has decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution, as it has done since 2004, in order to reiterate its support for the eminently humanitarian goals of the Convention. The Kingdom of Morocco is convinced of the ongoing relevance of the humanitarian principles of that international instrument, in particular the protection of civilian populations from the unacceptable destruction caused by anti-personnel mines.

Morocco reaffirmed its endorsement of the universal momentum in favour of eliminate anti-personnel mines by ratifying, in March 2002, Amended Protocol II of the 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. It has also, since 2003, regularly submitted a national report on the implementation of the provisions of the Protocol.

In the same spirit, Morocco implements the provisions of the Ottawa Convention on mine clearance, the destruction of stockpiles, awareness-

raising and training activities, and the provision of assistance to victims of anti-personnel mines. In this regard, it is appropriate to highlight the following.

The Royal Armed Forces have carried out remarkable demining efforts that have led to the collection and destruction of 101,311 anti-tank mines, including 160 in 2008, and of 89,203 anti-personnel mines, including 278 in 2008. The Moroccan authorities have assumed responsibility for the treatment of mine victims and for their medical, social and economic rehabilitation. Morocco has provided continual demining support to countries in the region and has maintained a running dialogue with non-governmental organizations aimed at achieving the objectives of the Convention.

The Kingdom of Morocco has, since 2006, regularly submitted a voluntary report, in accordance with article 7 of the Ottawa Convention, on the measures pursuant to the provisions of the Convention.

Morocco participates regularly in the Meetings of States Parties to the Convention and stresses its support for the current review process leading up to the Second Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention, which will be held in Cartagena de Indias, Colombia, from 3 November to 4 December. The Kingdom of Morocco's adherence to the Convention is a strategic objective that is closely linked to its national security needs with respect to maintaining its territorial integrity.

Ms. Shilli (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya would like to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.53, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya believes that the existing international mechanisms have not taken into account the problem of landmines in an objective manner and do not constitute a balanced way of looking at the issue. They do not take into account the concerns of a large number of affected Member States. The issue of anti-personnel mines has been dealt with in an imbalanced fashion in the Ottawa Convention on Landmines. Unfortunately, that Convention totally prohibits the use of such mines by the most impoverished countries and has prevented them from using those simple and weak defensive weapons, which

are useful only to defend our borders. The Convention also does not take into account the reality of affected countries that are subject to occupation, aggression and invasion, which should be forbidden so as to eliminate any cause for the use of anti-personnel mines.

In view of all that I have just said, it is imperative that we review the Ottawa Convention and implement its provisions in a more practical way if we really want it to be an instrument that meets the needs of all and is acceptable to all.

First, all mines and explosive ordnance should be cleared from the soil of many countries that remain polluted although they are no longer at war. Secondly, the victims of anti-personnel mines and other explosives should be given medical treatment and socially rehabilitated. Thirdly, steps should be taken to address the harmful effects of those explosive remnants of war on the environment. Fourthly, the laying of mines in the territories of third countries should be prohibited, and countries laying them should either demine or pay for the demining.

Fifthly, the production and possession of weapons of mass destruction should be totally banned before anti-personnel landmines are prohibited. Sixthly, poor countries should also be allowed to use anti-personnel mines to defend their territories and their borders because the Ottawa Convention of 1997, in its current version, is not at all balanced and should address the concerns, fears and interests of all countries.

My country therefore calls for a review and reformulation of the text of the Convention such that it responds to those needs that I have listed, reflecting the concerns of a large number of countries. If these concerns and demands of many delegations present are not taken into account, they will be justified in abstaining in the voting on this draft resolution, which is introduced regularly in this forum, while a large number of States parties to the Convention that may have joined it unwittingly will be justified in withdrawing from it, in accordance with article 20 of the Ottawa Convention.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.37. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.37, 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 14th meeting, on 19 October 2009. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/64/L.37.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement of the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.37.

Under the terms of paragraphs 12 and 13 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 Third Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol V, to be held on 9 and 10 November 2009, for the Eleventh Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, to be held on 11 November 2009, and for the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention, to be held on 12 and 13 November 2009, as well as for any continuation of work after the meetings; and 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 the servicing of three meetings of the States parties, to be held from 9 to 13 November 2009, have been prepared by the Secretariat and approved by the Tenth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, held in Geneva on 12 November 2008; by the Second Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol V, held in Geneva on 10 and 11 November 2008; and by the Meeting of High Contracting Parties to the Convention, held in Geneva on 13 and 14 November 2008.

The Secretary-General also wishes to draw the attention of Member States to the fact that the cost of the Third Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol V, the Eleventh Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol

II and the Meeting of High Contracting Parties to the Convention would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention that participate 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 for the Eleventh Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, the Third Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol V and the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention should thus have no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations.

Following the established practice, the Secretariat will prepare cost estimates for any continuation of the work after the meetings for the approval of the high contracting 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 only after sufficient funding is received, in advance, from States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in the meetings.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.37 would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.37 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.42/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate recorded votes have been requested on paragraphs 4 and 15. 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.42/Rev.1, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”, was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the 14th meeting, on 19 October 2009. The sponsors are listed in documents L.42/Rev.1 and

CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Burkina Faso, Ecuador and Sierra Leone have become sponsors.

In connection with the draft resolution, I wish to put on record the following statement on financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

Under the terms of operative paragraphs 6, 15 and 16 of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.42/Rev.1, the General Assembly would decide that, in conformity with the follow-up to the Programme of Action, the next biennial meeting of States to consider the national, regional and global implementation of the Programme of Action shall be held in New York from 14 to 18 June 2010; recall its decision to convene an open-ended meeting of governmental experts for a period of one week, no later than in 2011, to address key implementation challenges and opportunities relating to particular issues and themes, including international cooperation and assistance; and also recall its decision to convene a conference to review progress made in implementation of the Programme of Action, for a period of two weeks in New York, no later than in 2012.

Pursuant to operative paragraphs 6 and 16 of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the biennial meeting of States would hold one session of one week's duration in New York from 14 to 18 June 2010 and one session of two weeks' duration in New York no later than in 2012. The conference servicing requirements for those sessions of meetings of States are estimated to be \$259,800 at current rates in 2010 and \$429,500 at current rates in 2012. The requirements in 2010 have been included in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011, while the requirements in 2012 would be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

As concerns paragraph 15 of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the General Assembly would convene an open-ended meeting of governmental experts for a period of one week, no later than 2011. The conference-servicing requirements for an open-ended meeting of governmental experts are estimated to be \$234,900 at current rates in 2011. These requirements have been included in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.42/Rev.1, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

Separate recorded votes have been requested for operative paragraphs 4 and 15. The Committee will take action on those paragraphs in that order, and then we will vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

The Committee will now take a separate vote on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.42/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

“Recalls its endorsement of the report adopted at the third biennial meeting of States to consider the implementation of the Programme of Action, and encourages all States to implement the measures highlighted in the section of the report entitled ‘The way forward’.”

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 (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, 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, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 177 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a separate vote on operative paragraph 15 of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.42/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

“Recalls its decision to convene an open-ended meeting of governmental experts for a period of one week, no later than in 2011, to address key implementation challenges and opportunities relating to particular issues and themes, including international cooperation and assistance.”

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 (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia,

Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, 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, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Operative paragraph 15 was retained by 177 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.42/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, 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, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian

Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.42/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 179 votes to none.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.53. A recorded vote has been requested. 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.53, 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 Switzerland at the 15th meeting, on 20 October 2009. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/64/L.53.

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

In connection with the draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.53, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", I wish to put on record the following statement of financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General. 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, pending a decision to be taken at the Second Review Conference; 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 Second Review Conference and future meetings as observers.

In accordance with article 14 of the Convention, the cost of the next Review Conference of the

Convention would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention, participating in the Conference in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately. The Secretariat will prepare cost estimates for the Review Conference for the approval of the States parties, following planning missions to assess the requirements for conference facilities and services.

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 only after 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.1/64/L.53 would not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.53.

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 (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, 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, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco,

Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, 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.1/64/L.53 was adopted by 158 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Aly (Egypt): I have taken the floor to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.53, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction": the Ottawa Convention. Egypt abstained in the vote on that draft resolution, on the Ottawa Convention, due to the particularly unbalanced nature of that instrument, which was developed and concluded outside the United Nations context.

Egypt acknowledges the humanitarian considerations that the Ottawa Convention attempted to embody. Egypt had actually already imposed a moratorium on its landmine production and exports in

the 1980s, long before the conclusion of the Ottawa Convention. However, Egypt views the Convention as lacking balance between the humanitarian considerations relating to anti-personnel landmine production and the legitimate, controlled military use of such mines for border protection. The Convention, regrettably, does not acknowledge the legal responsibility of States for demining anti-personnel landmines that they themselves have laid on the territory of other States, making it almost impossible for many States to meet the Convention's demining requirements on their own. This is particularly true in the case of Egypt, with millions of anti-personnel landmines on its territory that were planted by Second World War Powers.

The aforementioned weaknesses are only compounded by the weak international cooperation system of the Convention, which remains limited in its effects and very dependent on the will of donor States. The weakness of the Ottawa Convention has kept the world's largest producers and some of the world's most heavily affected States outside its regime, making the potential for its universality questionable and reminding us all of the value of concluding arms control and disarmament agreements in the context of the United Nations and not outside its framework.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.53, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". Russia is not a party to the Convention. We are against the creation of processes in parallel to existing disarmament forums, because it is our belief that all matters of principle regarding mines should be resolved within the framework of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW). At the same time, Russia supports the humanitarian goals pursued by the parties to the Mine-Ban Convention and is ready to assist in implementing them. In this regard, the Russian Federation intends, for the first time, to participate in the work of the Cartagena Conference as an observer and will pay for its participation in a timely manner.

Ms. Skorpen (Norway): Norway is taking the floor with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.37, on the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW). Norway supports the draft resolution as such,

but we question the rationale for the CCW to continue processes on issues that are being dealt with comprehensively in other forums, such as the ongoing process on a protocol on cluster munitions. Cluster munitions in all their aspects are dealt with in a comprehensive manner in the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM). Half of the world's nations have already signed on to the Convention, which will enter into force next year. The CCM has set an international norm that cluster munitions are not to be used again.

Against that background, we do not see the need to create a new implementation mechanism of the CCW. We consider that the time has come for the States parties, when meeting in November, to conclude that the continued process of expert meetings on cluster munitions is no longer useful. We would welcome an open and frank discussion on the future work of the CCW and a determination of whether there are areas where the CCW could make concrete contributions. The value of the CCW should be measured on the basis of its positive humanitarian effect on the ground.

Norway will continue to engage actively and constructively in discussions with the aim of ensuring that the CCW will be able to fulfil its potential.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I have asked for the floor to explain our decision to abstain in the vote 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", contained in document A/C.1/64/L.53. Landmines continue to play a significant role in the defence needs of many States, especially those in regions of conflicts and disputes. Given our security compulsions and the need to guard our long borders not protected by any natural obstacles, the use of landmines forms an important part of our self-defence strategy. As such, 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 the total elimination of anti-personnel mines can best be promoted by, inter alia, making available non-lethal militarily effective and cost-effective alternative technologies. Pakistan remains committed to pursuing the objectives of a universal and non-discriminatory ban on anti-personnel mines in a manner which takes into account the legitimate defence requirements of States.

Pakistan is a party to Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional (CCW), 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. Pakistan, as one of the largest troop contributors to United Nations-led peacekeeping operations, has actively contributed to demining operations in several affected countries in the past. We are prepared to provide training facilities to mine-affected countries.

There has never been a humanitarian situation caused by the use of these mines in Pakistan. We remain committed to ensuring that mines in our military inventory will never become a cause of civilian casualties in Pakistan or elsewhere in the world.

Mrs. Diallo (Mali) (*spoke in French*): I am taking the floor simply to state that Mali is indeed a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.42/Rev.1. Mali is facing a problem related to small arms and light weapons in the northern part of its territory, and that is why my country wishes to be among the sponsors.

Mr. Poo (Singapore): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.53, 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 landmines 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 this 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 counterproductive.

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. Rao (India): India abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.53, 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. In 1997 India discontinued the production of non-detectable anti-personnel mines and since then has observed a moratorium on their transfer.

On the issue of anti-personnel landmines, India supports the approach enshrined in Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, to which it is a State party, which addresses the legitimate defence requirements of States, especially those with long borders. The availability of militarily effective alternative technologies that can cost-effectively perform the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines will considerably facilitate the goal of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines.

India remains committed to increased international cooperation and assistance for mine clearance and rehabilitation of mine victims and is willing to contribute technical assistance and expertise to that end. Since the Nairobi Review Conference of the Anti-personnel Landmine Convention, India has participated in all of the meetings of States parties as an observer. India will participate as an observer at the Cartagena summit later this year.

Mr. Kim Bonghyun (Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.53, 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 in previous sessions, the Republic of

Korea fully sympathizes with the spirit and objectives of the Ottawa Convention and this draft resolution.

However, due to the unique security situation on the Korean peninsula, we cannot but place priority on security concerns and are unable to accede to the Ottawa Convention at this point. Therefore, we have abstained in the voting on this draft resolution.

Nonetheless, we are no less concerned about the problem associated with anti-personnel mines. The Republic of Korea is fully committed to mitigating humanitarian suffering caused by anti-personnel mines. In that regard, my Government is exercising tight control over anti-personnel landmines and enforcing a moratorium on their export for an indefinite period of time. We have also responded regularly to the International Campaign to Ban Landmines annual questionnaire, providing all relevant information on our landmine policies and activities as a confidence-building measure.

As a State party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its Amended Protocol II, the Republic of Korea has actively participated in a range of discussions and activities to ensure only limited and responsible use of landmines. In addition, since 1993 my Government has made a meaningful contribution of more than \$6.75 million to demining, as well as to victim assistance, through relevant United Nations mine-action programmes, including the thematic trust fund of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Action and the United Nations Development Group Iraq Trust Fund.

The Republic of Korea will continue to do our part to that end in close cooperation with other countries, international organizations and civil society.

Mr. Asayesh Talab Tousi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain my delegation's position regarding draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.42/Rev.1, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

My delegation expressed its views and considerations on some specific paragraphs of the draft resolution in a transparent manner in the informal consultation meeting held by the authors of the text. Our concerns are as follows.

We believe that the applied procedure and method of work on the draft outcome of the Third Biennial

Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects fell far short of General Assembly standards and principles, including transparency and inclusiveness. Therefore, my delegation cannot go along with the endorsement of the outcome of the Third Biennial Meeting of States, as stipulated in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. At the same time, paragraph 15, which contains a selective approach in dealing with the Programme of Action, is not acceptable to us either.

Nevertheless, I would like to emphasize that Iran attaches great importance to combating the trafficking of small arms and light weapons, has actively and constructively participated in the relevant meetings and negotiations on the United Nations Programme of Action, and will continue to do so in the hope that a transparent method of work will be implemented in future meetings on this issue.

Ms. Shilli (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of Libya wishes to express its position on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/64/L.37, 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".

We would like to underscore that our acceptance of the consensus does not mean that we fully accept the provisions of the Convention, to which Libya is not party. We believe that its provisions and protocols do not address certain issues in sufficient depth, in particular regarding explosive remnants of war, including landmines laid in formerly warring countries, such as during the Second World War. Unfortunately, that is indeed the case with respect to the Ottawa Convention on the prohibition of the use of anti-personnel mines, which to date has not taken into account the concerns of all parties. We hope that that will soon be remedied.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee has thus concluded action on cluster 4, as listed in revision 1 of informal paper 2.

We shall now move on to the draft resolutions under cluster 5.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions listed in revision 1 of informal

paper 2 under cluster 5, I call on the representative of Gabon to make a general statement.

Mr. Onanga Ndiaye (Gabon) (*spoke in French*): I am speaking on behalf of the 11 States of Central Africa — Angola, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe and my own country, Gabon, all members of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa — in order simply to reaffirm our commitment to the activities of the Advisory Committee and, consequently, our support for draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.27, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”.

The draft resolution was coordinated and drafted by my country this year. I would also like to add that the draft resolution, which the countries of Central Africa that I have named wish to see adopted by consensus this afternoon, is merely the outcome of the most recent meeting of the Standing Advisory Committee, held in Libreville on 28 May 2009. The draft resolution appreciably resembles last year’s resolution 63/78, but reflects certain changes in line with the recommendations of the meeting that I have just mentioned.

Essentially, the draft resolution reaffirms the role of the Standing Advisory Committee, which has undertaken confidence-building and reconstruction activities among its member States in Central Africa, including through measures of trust and arms limitation. It also reaffirms the importance of disarmament and arms limitation programmes in central Africa carried out by the States of the subregion with the support of the United Nations, the African Union and other international partners; welcomes the adoption by States members of the Standing Advisory Committee of the Code of Conduct for the Defence and Security Forces in Central Africa and the major strides made by States in the drafting of a legal instrument on the control of small arms and light weapons in Central Africa; and encourages interested countries to provide their financial support to the implementation of the Sao Tome Initiative.

The draft resolution also welcomes the adoption of the Libreville Declaration calling on States members

of the Committee to contribute to the Special Trust Fund for the Standing Advisory Committee. Finally, the draft resolution expresses its satisfaction to the Secretary-General for his support for the revitalization of the activities of the Standing Advisory Committee, and requests him to continue to provide the assistance needed to ensure the success of its regular biannual meetings.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.27. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.27, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”, was introduced by the representative of Gabon at the 17th meeting, on 22 October 2009. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/64/L.27 and A/C.1/64/CRP.4/Rev.3.

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

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.27, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”, I wish to put on record the following statement on the financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

Under the terms of operative paragraphs 7, 8 and 11 of draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.27, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to continue their assistance to the countries of Central Africa in tackling the problems of refugees and displaced persons in their territories; request the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to continue to provide their full assistance for the proper functioning of the Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa; express its satisfaction to the Secretary-General for his support for the revitalization of the activities of the Standing Advisory Committee, and request him to continue to provide the assistance needed to ensure the success of its regular biannual meetings.

Implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution regarding the provision of assistance to the countries of Central Africa in tackling the problems of refugees and displaced persons in their territories would be subject to the availability of voluntary contributions to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

Implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution regarding the provision of full assistance for the proper functioning of the Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa would be carried out within the resources provided under section 23, "Human rights", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011. Implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 11 of the draft resolution regarding the provision of the assistance needed for the success of the Standing Advisory Committee's regular biannual meetings would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.27, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): 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.1/64/L.27 was adopted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee has thus concluded action on cluster 5. We shall now move on to the draft resolutions listed under cluster 6.

I give the floor to the representative of Cuba for a general statement.

Mrs. Sánchez Quintero (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to make a general statement on cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security", under which is presented draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.39, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". The draft resolution addresses highly relevant issues, for which reason we have decided to co-sponsor it again this year.

Cuba fully shares the concern expressed in the draft resolution regarding the use of technologies and means of information for purposes that are not inconsistent with the objectives of maintaining international stability and security and may adversely affect the integrity of the infrastructure of States.

The draft resolution appropriately stresses the need to prevent the use of information resources or technologies for criminal or terrorist purposes. In that context, my delegation is compelled once again to denounce the radio and television aggression that the United States Government has conducted against Cuba for several decades. This aggression is an open infringement of the principles of international law and the standards and regulations of the International Telecommunication Union. The United States Government does not care about the harm it could cause to international peace and security by creating such dangerous situations as the use of military aircraft to transmit television signals to Cuba without our consent.

In recent years, radio transmissions to Cuba from the United States have occurred more than 2,300 hours per week via various services and radio frequencies. Many of the radio stations involved belong to or provide services to organizations linked to known terrorist entities that act against Cuba from United States territory. They broadcast programmes to incite acts of sabotage, including political attacks, assassinations and other actions comprising terrorist activities. The World Radiocommunication Conference in Geneva has spoken out repeatedly against the illegal transmissions against Cuba from military aircraft, and has described them as contravening radio communication regulations.

Cuba will continue to take all measures available to repel these unacceptable, illegal and aggressive actions and will continue to denounce such aggression in all possible international forums. We trust that draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.39 will receive, as it has in the past, the support of a broad majority of delegations.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 6.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.39. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.39, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”, was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 16th meeting, on 21 October 2009. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/64/L.39 and A/C.1/64/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Rwanda has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.39 was adopted.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.50. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6 (d), 6 as a whole and 8. 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.50, entitled “Transparency in armaments”, was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the 16th meeting, on 21 October 2009. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/64/L.50 and A/C.1/64/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Bolivia and Sierra Leone have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.50.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.50, entitled “Transparency in armaments”, I wish to put on record the following statement on the financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

By operative paragraphs 6 (d) and 7 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, with a view to the three-year cycle regarding review of the Register, to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for a group of governmental experts to be convened in 2012, to review the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the views expressed

by Member States and the reports of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development; and request the Secretary-General to implement the recommendations contained in his 2000, 2003, 2006 and 2009 reports on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development and to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for the Secretariat to operate and maintain the Register.

Pursuant to the request contained in operative paragraph 6 (d) of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the panel of governmental experts would hold three sessions, one in Geneva and two in New York, in 2012. The conference-servicing requirements for the three sessions of the group of governmental experts in 2012 have been estimated at \$861,300 at current rates. In addition, non-conference-servicing requirements — which include the travel of experts and the cost of consultants, along with general temporary assistance — have been estimated at \$423,500. Those requirements will be considered under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management”; section 4, “Disarmament”; and section 28D, “Office of Central Support Services”, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

With regard to the request contained in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, resources to ensure the continuing operation and maintenance of the Register have been included under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.50, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provision 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 Committee will first take action on operative paragraph 3. Paragraph 3 reads as follows:

“Calls upon Member States, with a view to achieving universal participation, to provide the Secretary-General, by 31 May annually, with the requested data and information for the Register, including nil reports if appropriate, on the basis of resolutions 46/36 L and 47/52 L, the recommendations contained in paragraph 64 of the 1997 report of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, the recommendations contained in paragraph 94 of the 2000 report of the Secretary-General and the appendices and annexes thereto, the recommendations contained in paragraphs 112 to 114 of the 2003 report of the Secretary-General, the recommendations contained in paragraphs 123 to 127 of the 2006 report of the Secretary-General and the recommendations contained in paragraphs 71 to 75 of the 2009 report of the Secretary-General.”

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, 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, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the

Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Operative paragraph 3 was retained by 147 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on operative paragraph 4. Paragraph 4 reads as follows:

“Invites Member States in a position to do so, pending further development of the Register, to provide additional information on procurement through national production and military holdings and to make use of the ‘Remarks’ column in the standardized reporting form to provide additional information such as types or models.”

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, 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, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa

Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 147 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 5. Paragraph 5 reads as follows:

“Also invites Member States in a position to do so to provide additional information on transfers of small arms and light weapons on the basis of the optional standardized reporting form, as adopted by the 2006 group of governmental experts, or by any other methods they deem appropriate.”

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, 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, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay,

Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Operative paragraph 5 was retained by 149 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on subparagraph (d) of operative paragraph 6. Subparagraph (d) of paragraph 6 reads as follows:

“Requests the Secretary-General, with a view to the three-year cycle regarding review of the Register, to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for a group of governmental experts to be convened in 2012, to review the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the views expressed by Member States and the reports of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development.”

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, 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, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary,

Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Nepal, 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, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Subparagraph (d) of operative paragraph 6 was retained by 147 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take action on paragraph 6 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, 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, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Nepal, 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, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Paragraph 6, as a whole, was retained by 148 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on operative paragraph 8. Paragraph 8 reads as follows:

“Invites the Conference on Disarmament to consider continuing its work undertaken in the field of transparency in armaments.”

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, 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, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Nepal, 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, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Operative paragraph 8 was retained by 146 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.50 as a whole, on which a separate recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, 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, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore,

Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.50, as a whole, was adopted by 150 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

The Chairperson (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall now give the floor to speakers who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted. Given the lateness of the hour, I would ask delegations to be as concise as possible in their statements.

Mr. Hassan (Sudan) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to explain the votes of the member States of the League of Arab States in connection with draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.50, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

The member States of the League of Arab States would like to stress once again their position on the issue of transparency in armaments, especially the United Nations Register of Conventional Weapons. For years, the members of the League have expressed their opinion on the question of transparency in armaments, particularly conventional weapons. Our position on the Register, which has always been clear and well established, is based on our long-held views with regard to international disarmament and on the specific situation in the Middle East.

We stress the importance of transparency in armaments because it is the appropriate tool for ensuring international peace and security. But we also

believe that ensuring transparency will have to include respect for a number of crucial principles that should be balanced, transparent and non-selective. Those principles should be strengthened by countries on the national, regional and international levels, in accordance with international law.

The United Nations Register of Conventional Weapons was the first attempt to that end by the international community, although it took place late in addressing the issue of transparency at the global level. Although there is no doubt as to the potential value of the Register as a tool for promoting confidence and early warning, it does give rise to several problems by virtue of the fact that half of the membership of the United Nations do not provide data for it. A preambular paragraph in the draft resolution bears that out.

We would also like to reiterate that we need to expand the scope of the Register, as experience has demonstrated that it addresses only seven types of conventional weapons and that it is not universally implemented. Several countries, including some States members of the League of Arab States, believe that the Register does not respond adequately to their security needs because of its currently limited character. We therefore believe that the success of the Register in the future will depend upon the will of Member States to behave more transparently and to generate more trust among themselves.

We believe that, in keeping with the Register's founding resolution 46/36, the Register should be expanded to include information on advanced conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons and advanced technologies with military applications. That would make the Register a more balanced, inclusive and less selective tool that can guarantee adherence by a large number of Member States.

The Middle East is a special region in that regard, as there is clearly no qualitative balance when it comes to armaments. We cannot guarantee transparency and confidence unless we address this issue comprehensively and in a balanced manner. Applying the principle of transparency in the Middle East to seven types of conventional weapons alone while ignoring highly advanced and lethal arms such as weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, proves that we are not addressing the issue in a balanced, comprehensive or transparent manner.

Specifically, when it comes to the Middle East, the Register does not take into account the fact that Israel continues to occupy Arab territories and to possess lethal weapons of mass destruction. Israel is the only State in the region that has not joined the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). It continues to ignore repeated appeals from the international community to accede to the NPT and to subject its nuclear facilities to the inspection regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

In that regard, I should like to refer to the two recent IAEA resolutions on Israel's nuclear capacity. As I said, Israel is continuing to ignore the international community's appeals to that end. All United Nations Member States know that Israel possesses such weapons, which raises doubts about international transparency and inspection.

The Register should be expanded to include national stocks of weapons and weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, that illustrates that the Register has failed, and therefore in its present form it cannot serve as an effective early warning system and cannot build confidence. That is why members of the League of Arab States abstained from voting.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic would like to reiterate its full support for the position of the member States of the League of Arab States with regard to transparency in armaments. In addition, my delegation would like to express its total support for the universal desire for an international community in which the threat or use of force does not exist, a world governed by the purposes and principles on the Charter of the United Nations, which is based on justice, equality and peace.

We also reiterate our readiness to participate in any good-faith international effort to achieve that goal. However, we wish to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.50, entitled "Transparency in armaments", does not take into account the particular situation that prevails in the Middle East. The Arab-Israeli conflict has continued because of Israel's continued occupation of Arab territories and its refusal to implement the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the fact that it has been armed to the teeth with a plethora of weapons of mass destruction by certain major Powers. Those

Powers have also equipped Israel with the most sophisticated and lethal conventional weapons. Moreover, Israel has the capability to manufacture and locally stockpile various advanced weapons systems, foremost among which are nuclear weapons.

Mr. Hellgren (Sweden): I should like to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) in connection with draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.39, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

The European Union supported the draft resolution. We note that a United Nations group of governmental experts will study existing and potential threats in the field of information security. We look forward to its report, which will be presented at the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly. We would, however, like to take this opportunity to highlight some key aspects of the relationship between security and telecommunication technologies.

The European Union supports the basic principle of the draft resolution that the dissemination and use of information technologies and means affect the interests of the entire international community and that optimal effectiveness is enhanced by broad international cooperation. The European Union is concerned that those technologies and means can potentially be used for purposes that are inconsistent with the objectives of maintaining international stability and security and may adversely affect the integrity of the infrastructure of States, to the detriment of their security in both the civil and military fields.

The threat to cybersecurity can originate from coordinated attacks by organized criminals, non-State

actors, including extremists and terrorists, and individual politically motivated hackers, as massive denial-of-service cyberattacks against a number of United Nations Member States demonstrate. In that regard, the EU refers to Security Council resolution 1822 (2008), which, inter alia, expresses deep concern about criminal misuse of the Internet by terrorist groups. The EU also welcomes the initiatives of regional and global organizations to enhance cybersecurity, notably the Global Cybersecurity Agenda of the International Telecommunication Union.

The EU also emphasizes the need to ensure a proper balance between the interests of law enforcement and respect for fundamental human rights as enshrined in the 1950 Council of Europe Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the 1966 United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and other applicable international human rights treaties that reaffirm the right of everyone to hold opinions without interference, as well as the right to freedom of expression and the rights concerning respect for privacy and the protection of personal data.

One of the effective ways to fight the criminal or illegal use of information technologies is State criminalization of the misuse of information technology and implementing measures designed to prevent damage to critical information infrastructure regardless of the source of the threat. In that regard, the EU would like to draw attention to the Convention on Cybercrime of the Council of Europe. The Convention is open for accession by non-members of the Council of Europe, and we call upon all States to accede to it.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.