



General Assembly

Sixty-sixth session

First Committee

23rd meeting

Friday, 28 October 2011, 3 p.m.

New York

Official Records

:

Chair: Mr. Viinanen (Finland)

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

Agenda items 87 to 106 (continued)

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

The Chair: This afternoon the Committee will continue to take action on draft resolutions and decisions submitted under agenda items 87 through 106. As I mentioned yesterday, we should aim to conclude our work today, in accordance with the recommendations of the General Committee. But if we have to continue into next week, we will. With the Committee's active support and cooperation, I think we can accomplish most of our work today.

We will begin where we left off yesterday, with statements in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions adopted under cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security", in the first revision of informal paper 2. Then we shall take up cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery", which is the last cluster under that first revision. Thereafter, the Committee will move full steam ahead to informal paper 3, which has now been circulated.

Mr. Al-Kuwari (Qatar) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to explain the vote of the Arab League group on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.29, on transparency in armaments.

The member States of the League of Arab States would like to reaffirm their position with regard to

transparency in armaments, especially with regard to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. For years, the member States of the Arab League have been expressing their opinions with regard to transparency in armaments. We adhere to the Register of Conventional Arms. Our opinions are firm and clear and are based on general perspectives with regard to disarmament, as well as on the specific nature of the situation in the Middle East.

We support transparency in armaments as a means to enhance international peace and security. We also believe that for any transparency machinery to be a success, we must follow certain essential guidelines that should be balanced, transparent and non-discriminatory. In addition, they must enhance the security of all countries at the national, regional and international levels, in accordance with international law.

The Register is the first attempt by the international community, at a very late stage, to address the issue of transparency on the international level. Although we cannot question the credibility of the Register as a confidence-building and early-warning mechanism, it faces a number of problems, the most significant of which is the fact that half the Member States insist on refraining from providing the Register with relevant information. Moreover, the member States of the League of Arab States would like to expand the scope of the Register, in particular because experience over the past few years has shown that it is limited to seven types of conventional

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.



weapons and is not carried out on the international level.

A number of member States of the Arab League believe that the Register does not fulfil their security needs because of its limited scope. Therefore, in the future, it will be up to the Member States to build confidence in the Register and to achieve more transparency. By virtue of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, we believe that the scope of the Register needs to be expanded to include advanced conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons, as well as advanced technology with military applications. That would make it more comprehensive and balanced and less discriminatory and would lead to more involvement by a larger number of participants.

The Middle East is a special region in that regard, which shows that there is no qualitative balance when it comes to weapons. For that reason, confidence and transparency can be achieved only in a comprehensive and balanced manner. Restricting this measure to seven types of weapons and neglecting the more advanced and destructive ones — such as weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons — is unbalanced and incomprehensive and will not achieve the desired results.

Above all, we must bear in mind the situation in the Middle East and Israel's occupation and possession of the most lethal weapons. Moreover, Israel is the only State in the region that is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Yet it insists on ignoring the repeated calls by the international community that it adhere to the NPT and subject its nuclear facilities to the comprehensive safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Israel continues to ignore the repeated calls by the international community, while all countries of the world are aware that it possesses all those weapons, thereby undermining the credibility of international oversight and transparency mechanisms.

Our failure to expand the scope of the Register to include all types of weapons — including weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons — is not an effective means for early warning or confidence-building. That explains the decision of the League of Arab States group to abstain in the voting.

Mr. Aljowaily (Egypt): I wish to explain Egypt's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1, entitled

“Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”.

Egypt has engaged constructively with the main sponsor, hoping to arrive at a text that would ensure a consensus on its provisions similar to the consensus that existed during the fifty-seventh session of the General Assembly. Unfortunately, and despite a few improvements in the text, the current version retains the language that had caused concern and had resulted in the changed pattern of adoption from consensus to vote.

The scope of the draft resolution extends beyond disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control agreements, as it refers to other commitments that are not clearly defined. The draft, in its preambular paragraphs, refers to compliance enforcement, which we believe is a matter that is subject to the provisions of each relevant disarmament and arms control agreement and the system that it creates, if any.

We in no way acknowledge the right of one or more States to enforce compliance by another State that is party to a treaty or an agreement. The appropriate framework is the United Nations and the authority and mechanisms provided for by the relevant agreements.

Additionally, paragraph 7 calls for “concerted action” to encourage compliance and to hold those not in compliance with such agreements accountable for their non-compliance in a manner consistent with the Charter of the United Nations. It is not clear which means are foreseen within the interpretation of “concerted action”, nor which mechanisms are prescribed.

A similar concern relates to paragraph 9, whose language addresses the taking of action on non-compliance, but is not restricted to intergovernmental outcomes of the United Nations and other international organizations.

Finally, the draft resolution misses the most relevant aspect of underscoring the urgency of achieving the universality of multilateral disarmament and non-proliferation agreements. Universality, in our view, is the most appropriate way to ensure compliance, without distinctions between those who are committed and asked to comply fully and those who are not committed and enjoy the full benefits of not having to comply with any obligation. Getting

around this by using terminology such as encouraging adherence by all Member States, or noting the importance of universal adoption, as appropriate, is simply not enough. For all those reasons, Egypt abstained in the voting on the draft.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on three of the draft resolutions that were adopted yesterday.

First, my delegation would like to reiterate its full support for the position adopted by the States members of the League of Arab States with regard to transparency in armaments. We wish to reaffirm our full support for the international objective of bringing about a world free of the use and the threat of use of force and governed by the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, which are based on peace, justice and equality. We affirm also our readiness to take part in any well-intentioned international efforts towards that end.

We would like to draw the attention of the First Committee to the fact that the draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments", contained in document A/C.1/66/L.29, does not take into account the special situation in the Middle East, where the Arab-Israeli conflict persists owing to Israel's continued occupation of Arab lands and its refusal to abide by the relevant Security Council resolutions. In addition, we would note its continued armament by major Powers with all types of weapons of mass destruction and their provision to it of the most lethal conventional weapons, as well as its ability to manufacture all types of advanced weapons — primarily nuclear weapons — and to stockpile them locally.

As regards the issue of compliance, my country abstained in the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments" (A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1), submitted by the United States of America, for the following reasons.

First, it is not reasonable to vote on a draft resolution that calls for compliance with nuclear non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments as long as Israel — a country that possesses nuclear weapons and refuses to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), and threatens with its nuclear weapons

regional peace and security in the Middle East — is one of the main sponsors of the draft resolution.

For that reason, the draft loses in principle all ethical credibility, especially given the fact that in one of its paragraphs, the Assembly calls on all States concerned to help those countries that are not parties to the NPT, including Israel, of course.

Secondly, compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments — which are extremely important and which my country supports — requires that the sponsors of the draft resolution themselves comply with the international agreements governing non-proliferation, foremost among which is the NPT itself, which is a principle that some of the sponsors do not abide by.

Thirdly, the draft resolution fails to mention the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the Conference on Disarmament. It therefore lacks logic and the functional balance required for harmony between the work and activities of the United Nations in New York, the IAEA in Vienna and the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

With regard to the draft resolution entitled "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures" (A/C.1/66.L.35), my country joined the consensus, based on its convictions and its support for the international wish to establish a world that abides by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. However, we would like to point out that the reports that the draft resolution invites from Member States should be submitted on a voluntary basis.

Mr. Proaño (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I refer to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1.

The delegation of Ecuador wishes to declare its full respect for and commitment to disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. It subscribes to all international instruments on that issue, in the areas of both weapons of mass destruction and in conventional weapons.

Ecuador clearly understands that the mechanisms for complying with the obligations undertaken by States in such instruments are stipulated in those instruments. We therefore believe that while the original text of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1 introduced some amendments that respond to the

concerns of various States, the document still does not go far enough in urging the adoption of agreed bilateral or multilateral measures. That could result in broad interpretations for actions, including unilateral action, and could contradict the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter, in particular Article 2.

Therefore, Ecuador, in abstaining in the voting on the draft resolution, recalls the existence of pending commitments and obligations in the context of nuclear disarmament. It hopes that in the future, the assessments of compliance or non-compliance with existing obligations in the area of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control will become increasingly more fair.

Mr. Ovsyanko (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): The Belarus delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1, on compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements.

The Republic of Belarus positively supports non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements. We express that through practical steps. The clearest, but far from the only, example of such action was our voluntary rejection of nuclear weapons and the destruction of more than 3,000 pieces of heavy artillery and military technical equipment. That was in the context of implementing the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe.

In our view, the need to implement our commitments made under international agreements is clear. Recognition of that need stems from the past, from the application of the Latin term *pacta sunt servanda*, which is a basic principle of international law, and from the need to comply with the obligations and compliance mechanisms in the United Nations Charter and the many decisions and resolutions following thorough consideration by Member States in the context of relevant mechanisms.

We abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1, which the Committee adopted yesterday. That was due not so much to its provisions, but to our doubts with regard to the readiness of the initiators of the document to set out clear provisions in the draft text.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Compliance with

non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments".

My delegation fully subscribes to the core objectives of the draft resolution. We agree that all States must comply with all their obligations arising from the treaties to which they are parties. There can be no selectivity or exceptions. We also believe that full compliance with treaty obligations by all States parties is essential for regional and global peace, security and stability. We concur that all States must fully comply with the Charter of the United Nations. However, the concepts and practices of compliance, verification and enforcement must be anchored strictly in legality.

Such issues are integrally related, and not only when they are agreed to by States in treaties and conventions, including in the areas of arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament agreements. They have no independent existence. They can be neither promoted in a vacuum nor enforced selectively. In fact, some of the major disarmament initiatives have suffered setbacks precisely because of partial compliance or lack of compliance or double standards with regard to some of the treaty obligations on the part of some States parties. Similar concerns have also been expressed on account of a lack of enforcement mechanisms or of political will to enforce the obligations of some States.

We would have wished for a more consultative approach on the draft text before its introduction not only to seek to bridge some of the ambiguous formulations but also in keeping with the tradition of holding informal consultations. We hope that a spirit of dialogue and accommodation will be pursued when the draft resolution on this subject is presented in the future.

In view of those considerations, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft text.

Mr. Singh Gill (India): We also asked for the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1.

India voted in favour of the draft resolution since it believes in the responsibility of States to fully comply with their obligations as undertaken in the various agreements on disarmament, non-proliferation and arms limitation to which they are parties. Commitments of States also arise from the obligations

that States have undertaken voluntarily and in exercise of their sovereignty.

We believe that in encouraging the compliance of other States with the disarmament, non-proliferation and arms limitation agreements to which they are parties, or in pursuing appropriate areas of cooperation to increase confidence and compliance, States should act in accordance with the compliance mechanisms and other provisions in the relevant agreements and in a manner consistent with the United Nations Charter and international law.

Similarly, they shall also resolve any issues related to compliance by a State with its obligations in respect of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms limitation agreements to which it is a party, in accordance with the compliance mechanisms provided in the relevant agreements and in a manner consistent with the United Nations Charter and international law.

We would also like to emphasize the importance of multilateralism in addressing issues that may arise in relation to non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments.

Finally, it is also our understanding that other agreed obligations imply only those obligations that have been undertaken by States voluntarily and in exercise of their sovereignty.

Mr. Seruhere (United Republic of Tanzania): I wish to take this opportunity to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.29. I promise to be very brief.

My delegation wishes to explain why it abstained in yesterday's voting on the draft, entitled "Transparency in armaments". In principle, we are not against the draft resolution. However, the United Republic of Tanzania, in reference to paragraph 1, wishes and would request that small arms and light weapons in all their aspects be included in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. That position is based on the humanitarian principle that recognizes the sanctity of human life. The loss of innocent lives and the destruction of property on account of small arms and light weapons are not acceptable to my delegation. Moreover, such weapons are used to carry out acts of terrorism, piracy and destabilization and in conflicts.

The time to recognize and take decisive action against the menace of small arms and light weapons is now, not tomorrow.

The Chair: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

We now turn to cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 7, I shall give the floor to those delegations that wish to introduce draft resolutions or make general statements.

Mr. Adejola (Nigeria): Our delegation is taking the floor once again, on behalf of the African Group, to introduce and orally revise draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.52, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa".

Paragraph 4 will now read as follows:

"Further welcomes the contribution of the Regional Centre to continental disarmament, peace and security, in particular its assistance to the African Union Commission in the elaboration of the African Union Strategy on the Control of Illicit Proliferation, Circulation and Trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons and the ongoing process on seeking an African common position on the proposed arms trade treaty; and to the African Commission on Nuclear Energy in its implementation of the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Pelindaba)".

We hope that, with this oral revision, draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.52 will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. Kellerman (South Africa): I have the honour, on behalf of the Netherlands, Switzerland and my own country, South Africa, to introduce an oral revision to paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.39, entitled "Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations".

In the first line of paragraph 5, the words "in the appropriate forums" should be added after "invites States". Paragraph 5 will therefore read:

"Invites States, in the appropriate forums, to explore, consider and consolidate options, proposals and elements for a revitalization of the United Nations disarmament machinery as a

whole, including the Conference on Disarmament”.

With this revision, it is the hope of the drafters that the draft resolution will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. Eloumni (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): No body and no instrument can ensure effective progress in the field of disarmament in the absence of genuine political will and a favourable international context. The adoption of the consensus rule in the Conference on Disarmament and in general is designed to garner the greatest possible support for the decisions adopted while enabling every Member State to bring its influence to bear on the decision-making process. However, it must be stressed that consensus should not represent an obstacle in this respect.

While respecting the legitimate and sovereign right of Member States to accept or reject proposed decisions, we believe that those States must demonstrate flexibility and a sense of responsibility. The Conference on Disarmament, which has in the past demonstrated its effectiveness and shown that it can succeed, remains the appropriate forum for progress to be made in negotiations on disarmament. To that end, the Conference must adopt a comprehensive, integrated and pragmatic approach.

The safety and security of a region is more than ever before closely interrelated with that of the rest of the world. Likewise, international security cannot be maintained and strengthened if legitimate national and regional security concerns are not integrated therein. It is therefore very important to undertake steps that take into account national, regional and global security.

Morocco reiterates its attachment to the United Nations bodies and mechanisms competent in the field of nuclear disarmament, and calls for caution in the face of the temptation to launch negotiations outside the Conference on Disarmament and other multilateral entities. While such an approach could accelerate negotiations, it could also lead to results that would not be acceptable to many countries. Such an option might also accentuate disagreements on disarmament and non-proliferation issues that actually demand the largest possible consensus.

Morocco reiterates its support for the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in order to establish a general diagnosis of United Nations disarmament mechanisms,

to agree on solutions to the systemic problems of those mechanisms, and to enhance their effectiveness. Morocco is prepared, within the context of its principles, to consider any proposal that might foster real progress in the field of disarmament.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): As a country that attaches much importance to making progress in the field of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation, Germany cannot but deeply regret the stalemate that has prevented the Conference on Disarmament for well over a decade from doing the work it is mandated to do, which is to negotiate and agree on new instruments in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. Likewise, we view the persistent lack of tangible results over many years in the United Nations Disarmament Commission as yet another cause for concern.

There is significant political will among a vast majority of States for starting negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament (CD). In fact, in 2009 there was agreement in the CD to start negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty and to address the other important core issues on the CD's agenda in a substantive manner. Unfortunately, it turned out somewhat later that that agreement could not be implemented as a result of the procedural manoeuvres of one delegation. Germany continues to be convinced that political will remains today among a vast majority of States to proceed along the lines of the consensus reached in 2009.

The manner in which the consensus rule has been applied in the Conference on Disarmament by virtually turning it into a veto right, even on small procedural issues, has brought the CD into a situation where each and every single member can nullify the political will of the overwhelming majority of States merely to start — and I repeat, to start — negotiating processes.

I think everyone can see that this is a recipe for enduring stalemate and permanent gridlock. It should be borne in mind that the negotiation of the major disarmament and non-proliferation treaties has either not started or not ended with everybody fully on board. In fact, we would in most probability still be waiting for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty if such a rigid form of the consensus rule had been applied in both instances as it is now being applied in the Conference on Disarmament.

It is against that background that Germany has fully supported the efforts of the Secretaries-General of the United Nations and the Conference on Disarmament to revitalize multilateral disarmament, and it is against that background that we have followed the various initiatives and attempts that have been made in draft resolutions in this year's First Committee to move the CD forward and to revitalize the multilateral disarmament process with a great deal of interest and sympathy. The German delegation has tried its best to support initiatives in this field.

We very much hope that the debates we have had on these initiatives and draft resolutions will energize the Conference on Disarmament in its 2012 session so as to get it really under way at long last. If, sadly, that were once again not the case, Germany is confident that the discussions we have had here this year have made an important contribution towards laying the basis for remedies to be discussed and decided on in next year's session of the First Committee.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.39.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.39, entitled "Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations", was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the 17th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.39 and CRP.3/Rev.4.

The representative of South Africa has just introduced an oral amendment to the text of the draft resolution. Paragraph 5 should read as follows:

"Invites States, in the appropriate forums, to explore, consider and consolidate options, proposals and elements for a revitalization of the United Nations disarmament machinery as a whole, including the Conference on Disarmament."

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.39 has 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.1/66/L.39, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.52.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.52, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the African Group at the 18th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.52.

According to a statement just made by the representative of Nigeria, paragraph 4, as orally amended, should read as follows:

"Further welcomes the contribution of the Regional Centre to continental disarmament, peace and security, in particular its assistance to the African Union Commission in the elaboration of the African Union Strategy on the Control of Illicit Proliferation, Circulation and Trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons and the ongoing process of seeking an African common position on the proposed arms trade treaty; and to the African Commission on Nuclear Energy in its implementation of the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Pelindaba)".

With the permission of the Chair, I will now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General.

The provisions for the implementation of operative paragraphs 9 and 10 of the draft resolution that this document concerns have been considered under section 4, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. In that regard, the provision with respect to operative paragraph 10 of the draft resolution covers one P-5 post for the Director of the Centre, one P-3 post, two local level posts and general operating expenses under section 4, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. The programme activities of the Regional Centre would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources.

The Chair: 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

shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.52 was adopted.

The Chair: I now call on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of position.

Mr. Suljuk Mustansar Tarar (Pakistan): My delegation is in full accord with the need to revitalize the work of the Conference on Disarmament and to advance multilateral disarmament negotiations. We therefore joined consensus on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/66/L.39, as orally revised.

Revitalization efforts would, however, remain partial and be seen as partisan if the focus remains only on the Conference on Disarmament. That is because the nature of the challenges afflicting the Conference on Disarmament are similar to what is taking place in the other components of the United Nations disarmament machinery.

The common lament over the lack of political will is not unique to the Conference on Disarmament. It is equally manifest in the work of the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee. It is often claimed by some that they fully support nuclear disarmament but they continue to vote against the resolutions on the subject. Therefore, parallel and complementary efforts are required to reinvigorate the entire disarmament machinery.

Moreover, the continuing differences in the perceptions, approaches and modalities of promoting the disarmament and non-proliferation agenda suggest that the problems may not necessarily be with the machinery. After all, the disarmament bodies are only tools or mechanisms that States use to discuss, deliberate and negotiate disarmament issues. Such mechanisms cannot by themselves resolve differences among States.

In our view, the contemporary challenges on the disarmament canvas should aim beyond the machinery alone. We must work towards reconciling the differences in the priorities and subjects that could form the basis of an agreed disarmament agenda, taking into account the principle of equal security of States. Focusing only on the disarmament machinery will not by itself achieve anything.

For those reasons, Pakistan has been calling for the need to evolve consensus on a balanced disarmament agenda that not only takes into account the security interests of all States, but also advocates a reinvigorated machinery to promote that agenda. The Non-Aligned Movement, which represents the greatest majority grouping in the United Nations, has called for convening the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in an effort to try to break the current deadlock. We fully support that proposal and consider it among the doable and viable means of advancing the multilateral disarmament negotiations.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My country's delegation aligns itself with the consensus on the draft resolution entitled "Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations", contained in document A/C.1/66/L.39, as orally revised.

In that regard, my country's delegation affirms that the most appropriate body to consider the revitalization of disarmament mechanisms and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations is the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation on the draft resolution entitled "Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations", contained in document A/C.1/66/L.39, as orally revised.

In our view, the major problem facing multilateral disarmament negotiations is the lack of genuine political will on the part of certain Western countries, not the structure or working methods of such bodies. For example, the inability of the Conference on Disarmament to undertake substantive work on its agenda stems from the unwillingness of certain nuclear-weapon States to agree on a balanced and comprehensive programme of work to deal with all core issues.

The Conference on Disarmament is and should remain the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, and its role in the field of nuclear disarmament should be strengthened. The Conference was established and mandated by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to

disarmament. Therefore, in our view, paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, which refers to options for a revitalization of the United Nations disarmament machinery, including the Conference on Disarmament, is nothing other than the convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In the view of the Islamic Republic of Iran, in taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations, the international community should avoid exclusive and discriminatory approaches and must take into consideration the security interests of all States.

Mr. Magalhães (Brazil): Brazil did not oppose draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.39, entitled “Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”. Nevertheless, the delegation of Brazil wishes to express its apprehension concerning the wording of paragraph 8. That paragraph creates, if not encourages, the possibility of direct action by the First Committee on the reform of the Conference on Disarmament.

We should recall that the Conference on Disarmament was established by a special session of the General Assembly as part of a three-tiered machinery, also comprising the First Committee and the United Nations Disarmament Commission. During the high-level meeting and the follow-up plenary meeting States addressed all issues regarding disarmament and the machinery devoted to it, not just the functioning of the Conference on Disarmament. If we are to consider reforming the Conference, that must be part of an overall undertaking to review the United Nations disarmament machinery, in which case the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament would be the most appropriate venue.

Mr. Shen Jian (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China has consistently held that the Conference on Disarmament, as the only multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, should quickly adopt its programme of work and engage in a substantive, comprehensive and balanced manner to advance the multilateral disarmament negotiation process. For that reason, China joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.39, entitled “Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”.

China believes that any option for promoting multilateral disarmament negotiations should include

safeguarding the authority of the Conference on Disarmament and ensure that all parties participate. Only in that way can we achieve the goal of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation.

The Chair: The Committee has thus concluded action on cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”, in informal paper 2/Rev.1.

We will now move on to informal paper 3, which includes four clusters. We will begin in the customary way with cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”.

I shall now give the floor to delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions or to make general statements.

Ms. Golberg (Canada): Canada is pleased to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1. We welcome and appreciate the high degree of engagement of delegations in the preparation of the text, and we believe it was developed openly and transparently. The final version aims to reflect the important points that were raised by delegations in several productive consultations.

The goal of the draft resolution is for the General Assembly to reiterate its previous calls on the Conference on Disarmament (CD) to agree on and implement a comprehensive programme of work and to allow substantive work on non-proliferation and disarmament priorities to take place. Such a programme of work, in our view, must include commencing negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other explosive devices.

The draft resolution before us focuses on achieving a ban on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices, but it is indeed without prejudice to advancing work on other core issues, including discussions on nuclear disarmament, the prevention of an arms race in outer space and assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. That is explicitly acknowledged on more than one occasion in the draft resolution.

As a first step, the draft resolution calls on the Conference on Disarmament to agree on a programme of work that includes negotiations of a treaty early in 2012. That is not an ultimatum. For Canada, the CD remains the preferred forum in which such negotiations should take place, but the CD must work to restore

public faith in its ability to really act as the preferred disarmament negotiating body. Should the CD fail to agree on and implement a comprehensive programme of work by the end of its 2012 session, the draft resolution notes the value of options being considered by the General Assembly next year in order to determine how best to move forward productively.

In the meantime, the draft resolution concludes by encouraging interested States to continue efforts in support of such negotiations, including through expert meetings on technical issues. It is our sincere hope that this draft resolution will serve to reinforce the Conference on Disarmament, to shift the current dynamics, and to provide an opportunity to restore consensus on a comprehensive programme of work.

The status quo, in our view, poses a much greater danger to the future of the CD than the modest, innovative effort represented by this draft resolution. Indeed, without such efforts, the CD risks irrelevance and a loss of confidence, as the Secretary-General himself has already noted with concern.

Canada would therefore very much hope that all Member States will join in supporting this draft resolution as a united statement of our collective commitment to advancing non-proliferation and disarmament.

Ms. Higgie (New Zealand): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the seven members of the New Agenda Coalition: Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, South Africa, Sweden and my own country, New Zealand.

I wish to refer to the draft resolution submitted by the New Agenda Coalition, A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of disarmament commitments". The Committee will shortly take action on this draft resolution.

The New Agenda Coalition was founded in 1998 because of widespread dissatisfaction with the pace of nuclear disarmament. The members of the Coalition are committed to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in all its aspects. The draft resolution before the Committee today reaffirms that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing processes, and calls upon all States to comply fully with all commitments made

regarding nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation.

With the success of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT, this year's draft resolution, like last year's, reflects the New Agenda Coalition's specific focus on ensuring that the nuclear disarmament commitments contained in the Conference's action plan are implemented in full. Of course, that does not mean that we are less committed to the plan's other elements, but there are other draft resolutions that deal with those elements.

The revised text of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.31 was tabled on 21 October. The delay in its issuance was regrettable. As delegations will know, the only change to the text in A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1 relates to paragraph 8. In that paragraph, there is a small adjustment to reflect the recent positive announcement regarding the host Government and facilitator of the 2012 conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction.

We would not expect that minor but positive revision to cause difficulties for any delegation. We look forward to seeing continued strong support for the draft resolution as we move towards the first preparatory committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference.

I trust that delegations have not been inconvenienced by the regrettable delay in issuing draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1.

Mr. Cassidy (Indonesia): Indonesia, as the current Chair of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and the Chair of the Southeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Commission, is privileged to speak on behalf of the 10 States members of ASEAN: Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Viet Nam and my own country, Indonesia — as the First Committee considers draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.38, "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)", in cluster 1.

This draft resolution seeks to contribute significantly to the strengthening of the global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation regime. It is the sincere hope of all 10 ASEAN member States that the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone can be

regarded as a significant step towards achieving our common goal of a world without nuclear weapons. We hope that the adoption of the draft resolution will bring us closer to that common goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world.

We strongly believe that the adoption of the draft resolution would positively contribute towards the ongoing direct consultations between ASEAN and the nuclear-weapon States with the aim of ensuring the early accession of nuclear-weapon States to the protocol of the Treaty. It is our fervent hope that all United Nations Member States will support the draft resolution and the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty itself. We hope that the draft resolution can be adopted without a vote. We strongly believe that such unanimous support will help pave the way in achieving our common goal towards general and complete disarmament.

Finally, allow us also to express our appreciation to all Member States that have sponsored the draft resolution.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.25.

Mr. Suljuk Mustansar Tarar (Pakistan): I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/66/L.25, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", on behalf of the sponsors.

At the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, it was agreed to conclude an international instrument to provide binding and credible negative security assurances to the non-nuclear-weapon States. Unfortunately, subsequent steps by most non-nuclear-weapon States remain insufficient, qualified and partial.

It was expected that the end of the cold war would make it easier for the nuclear-weapon States to extend negative security assurances to the non-nuclear-weapon States. Regrettably, that has not happened, and the legitimate demand for negative security assurances by the overwhelming majority of countries, including the 120 members of the Non-Aligned Movement, remains unfulfilled.

Like draft resolutions adopted at previous First Committee sessions, this draft resolution has been

technically updated. While reaffirming the urgent need to reach an early agreement on effective international arrangements for negative security assurances, the draft resolution notes with satisfaction that there is no objection in principle to the idea of an international convention on that subject. It appeals to all States, especially the nuclear-weapon States, to work towards an early agreement and recommends further intensification of efforts to evolve a common approach and a common formula on the issue. Finally, it recommends that the Conference on Disarmament actively engage in negotiations with a view to reaching an early agreement on negative security assurances.

The sponsors believe that the conclusion of effective arrangements on negative security assurances could constitute a major confidence-building measure between the nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States, as well as among the nuclear-weapon States. Secondly, it could contribute to reducing nuclear danger. It could ease the threats that arise from new doctrines of nuclear use, and facilitate the negotiations on other matters relating to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

Accordingly, my delegation and the sponsors urge the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.25 with the widest possible majority.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Concerning cluster 1 of today, there are two draft resolutions that refer to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, one directly and the other indirectly.

First, concerning draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1, sponsored by the New Agenda Coalition, paragraph 10 refers directly to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and mentions the Six-Party Talks. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea highly appreciates the concerned attention of the New Agenda Coalition towards the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.

Moving on, I would like to draw attention to one basic factor. Paragraph 10 of the draft resolution conveys contradictory messages. It starts by urging the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to fulfil its commitments, including to the abandonment of nuclear weapons. Towards the end is the phrase "with a view to achieving the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula", which is correct. The concluding phrase "denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula", not the

denuclearization of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, is a correct expression of the reality.

However, the beginning of the paragraph contradicts that message. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is not working alone. There are six parties working together in the Six-Party Talks. So those Six-Party Talks have two key obligations — one towards the United States, the other towards the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The United States has maintained nuclear threats and a hostile policy against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for over six decades. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a victim. It has been living under nuclear threats for six decades. It has been living under nuclear threats. The draft resolution has singled out the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's abandonment, so that is not a correct reflection of the picture on the Korean peninsula.

Secondly, draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.37, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", in paragraph 5 indirectly refers to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by mentioning two Security Council resolutions. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea totally and categorically rejected those two resolutions against it with their accompanying sanctions for the following two reasons.

As I said earlier, with regard to the first draft resolution, the first factor is that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has been living under nuclear threat for six decades. If the nuclear weapons of the United States had not entered South Korea, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would never have gone nuclear. There would have been no need to go nuclear. So the starting point was the United States nuclear weapons.

The second factor concerns the great scepticism over the mandate of the Security Council. Its mandate is to provide peace and security for the world by correctly looking at international peace issues. However, it did not mention the nuclear threats of the United States against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It merely painted a false picture of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It also goes against the United Nations Charter. As a sovereign State, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has a full right to defend its topmost interest, the security and sovereignty of the country.

So, on account of those two considerations, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea asks for a recorded vote.

The Chair: Before taking action on the six draft resolutions before us in cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons" — A/C.1/66/L.15, A/C.1/66/L.25, A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1, A/C.1/66/L.37, A/C.1/66/L.38 and A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1 — I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on those draft resolutions before the voting.

Mr. Suljuk Mustansar Tarar (Pakistan): Pakistan will call for a recorded vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices".

We recognize the efforts made by the Canadian delegation to conduct a series of informal consultations on the draft resolution. We also note that the ill-advised and misguided efforts to constitute a group of governmental experts on fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) options had to be withdrawn as a result of strong opposition by Member States.

The draft text, however, remains flawed on two main counts. First, it retains the reference to consider options for FMCT negotiations, ostensibly outside the Conference on Disarmament. Secondly, despite its avowed claim that the FMCT would represent a significant contribution to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, the draft text keeps its non-proliferation-centric focus.

We are therefore obliged to once again vote against this draft resolution, because it calls for negotiations on a treaty that will only ban future production of fissile materials but will not seek to reduce the existing huge stocks of those fissile materials. Such a treaty would be inherently flawed, as it would freeze the existing asymmetry in fissile material stocks in perpetuity.

For Pakistan, that situation has been further aggravated, in view of the discriminatory nuclear cooperation agreements signed by some of the major nuclear-weapon States as well as some prominent advocates of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). As a result of those agreements, those States have not only violated their own NPT obligations, but have also made a mockery of the proposed FMCT. Since those agreements will

undermine Pakistan's security, Pakistan cannot therefore be a party to such a draft resolution.

We share the frustration expressed in the draft text about the years of stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament, but the stalemate is not due to the FMCT alone. In the interests of objectivity, it would have been appropriate to acknowledge the reasons for the decades of Conference on Disarmament deadlock on nuclear disarmament, negative security assurances and the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

It is evident that there are States in the Conference on Disarmament that are opposed to commencing negotiations on these three core items on its agenda. We have heard arguments by well-meaning delegations that Pakistan's concerns about the FMCT can be addressed during the negotiations. It is fair to ask why they maintain that the concerns of some major Powers on the other three core issues cannot also be addressed in the same manner.

If this logic holds, then the contentious elements pertaining to the issue of nuclear disarmament should not have prevented the commencement of negotiations on this single most important agenda item for the last 32 years. However, if that handful of States have legitimate security concerns, they should openly state their reasons for opposing the commencement of negotiations on the other three equally, if not more important, issues on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. The fact that they have chosen not to do so raises serious questions regarding their motives and their commitment to nuclear disarmament and, indeed, to the work of the Conference itself.

Ms. Poroli (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1.

The delegation of Argentina believes that the initiative of the Canadian delegation has merit. We therefore voted in favour of the draft at previous sessions of the General Assembly and will do so again this time around.

In that connection, we are in agreement with the spirit of this and other draft resolutions that attempt to contribute to revitalize the work of the Conference on Disarmament through the adoption and implementation of a programme of work leading to the start of substantive negotiations.

In that connection, Argentina stresses the role of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament. We believe that the best way of protecting the national interests of each and every State is through the start of substantive negotiations on all agenda items.

Likewise, we believe that the commencement of negotiations on specific issues outside of the Conference on Disarmament, even though it may be within the United Nations framework, should be considered on a case-by-case basis, depending on advisability and merits.

In that context, Argentina has a positive view of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1 in terms of substance, as it is in favour of the start of negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, because its conclusion will represent a substantive step forward towards nuclear disarmament.

However, we do not agree with the establishment of a priori options for future courses of action to be considered by the General Assembly should the Conference on Disarmament fail to agree on and implement its programme of work by the end of its 2012 session.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.15. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the seventh preambular paragraph. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.15, entitled "2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee", was introduced by the representative of the Philippines at the 13th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.15.

I shall now read out only the relevant parts of the oral statement, as requested by the Chair.

The oral statement concerns paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution. It states specifically that pursuant to the request contained in those paragraphs, it is the understanding of the Secretary-General that Secretariat assistance and substantive support services to the 2015 Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee will be required.

The conference-servicing costs of the first session of the Preparatory Committee in Vienna, based on documentation requirements from the previous review cycle, including interpretation and the provision of summary records, are estimated at \$1,456,956. In addition, no conference-servicing requirements for conference room set-up, security, travel, subsistence allowance or substantive staff from the Office for Disarmament Affairs, as well as information technology support, miscellaneous supplies, services and other, are estimated at \$1,404,133. In accordance with established procedures, the United Nations will levy a charge at the rate of 13 per cent of expenditures for such activities to defray the administrative and other support costs incurred during the implementation, which is estimated at \$208,141.57. Furthermore, in accordance with the established policies and procedures of the United Nations, a provision corresponding to 15 per cent of the estimated costs of the meeting would have to be made for the contingency reserves to cover eventual shortfalls, and final expenditures are estimated at \$271,384.59.

A decision on the dates and venues for the holding of further sessions of the Preparatory Committee and on the Review Conference is expected to be finalized by parties during the course of the Preparatory Committee, together with a number of other decisions on organizational arrangements, including the provision of summary records. All costs related to the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties and its Preparatory Committee shall be met in accordance with the arrangements made by the parties to the Treaty. Consequently, the request that the Secretary-General render the necessary assistance and provide such services, including summary records, as may be required by the 2015 Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee should not entail financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations.

Following the established practice, the Secretariat will prepare cost estimates for the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties and its Preparatory Committee for the approval of the States parties.

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

parties. In this connection, the Secretary-General advises that all final assessments which are outstanding for previous Review Conferences of the parties to the Treaty and its Preparatory Committee should be remitted by the States parties to the Secretariat as soon as possible. Further, the application of credits of the States parties from previous Review Conferences to the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty and its Preparatory Committee would be carried forward only when the outstanding balances have been remitted.

In summary, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.15 would not give rise to financial implications under the proposed budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

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, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova,

Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

India, Israel, Pakistan

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 169 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.15 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, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein,

Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

India, Israel, Pakistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.15 was adopted by 169 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.25. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.25, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 23rd meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in A/C.1/66/L.25 and CRP.3/Rev.1.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa,

Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.25 was adopted by 119 votes to none, with 56 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested on the resolution as a whole. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 1 and 9. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", was introduced by the representative of New Zealand at the 23rd meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1 and in A/C.1/66/CRP.3/Rev.5.

The Chair: We shall now take action on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1.

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, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives,

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

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

China, France, Georgia, India, Israel, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Operative paragraph 1 was retained by 163 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

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

The Chair: We shall now take action on operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic,

Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Bhutan, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 9 was retained by 160 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.31/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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, India, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

China, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1 was adopted by 160 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Bhutan advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain; the delegation of Mauritania had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.37. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.37, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 12th meeting of the Committee, on 14 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.37 and A/C.1/66/CRP.3/Rev.5.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on the sixth preambular paragraph.

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, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia,

Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, 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, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

India, Israel, Pakistan

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 168 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.37 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, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia,

Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, 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, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

India, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.37 was adopted by 170 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.38.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.38, entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok

Treaty)", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the States parties to the Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty) at the 23rd meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.38 and A/C.1/66/CRP.3/Rev.5.

The Chair: The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.38 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 2 and 3.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/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 at the 20th meeting, on 25 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, 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, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary,

Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan

Abstaining:

Algeria, China, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Israel, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mauritania, Myanmar, Oman, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 149 votes to 3, with 16 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, 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, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, 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, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Yemen

Operative paragraph 3 was retained by 148 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1 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, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, 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, Solomon Islands, 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, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Comoros, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya,

Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Yemen

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1 was adopted by 151 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to speak in explanation or vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mrs. Balaguer Labrada (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.37, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”, Cuba has maintained its clear position against all types of nuclear-weapon tests, including those conducted using supercomputers and other sophisticated explosive methods. That is why Cuba has always voted in favour of the draft resolution on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), which is introduced annually in the First Committee and which we have again supported this year.

Nevertheless, we believe that it is important to indicate that, with regard to its paragraph 5, the draft resolution distances itself from the highly technical character that it should have. Everyone knows about the inherent complexities of this delicate matter. The decisions made by the Security Council in that regard do not help to resolve the issue. We firmly believe that diplomacy and dialogue through peaceful means should continue with a view to reaching a long-term solution to the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula.

Moreover, we reiterate our deep concern at the slow progress towards nuclear disarmament and the lack of progress by nuclear-weapon States in completely eliminating their nuclear arsenals. We hope that in the future the sponsors of the draft resolution will keep attention centred on relevant issues related to the CTBT and avoid including controversial elements that can be easily manipulated. That will facilitate efforts to build the necessary consensus on the issue.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain my delegation’s vote on two draft resolutions.

The first is A/C.1/66/L.37, on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. My delegation voted in favour of the draft as a whole but would like to dissociate itself from paragraph 5, owing to the language used in the text and the way it has been drafted.

As explicitly stated in the United Nations Charter, the General Assembly is entitled to discuss independently any questions within the scope of the Charter and make recommendations. Therefore, in our view, there is no need to refer to the work of other organs of the United Nations in a resolution of the General Assembly, which was done in a completely different context.

I would also like to explain my delegation’s position on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”. My delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and voted against its paragraph 2. Some countries, by proposing and adopting that draft resolution — which is on a certain subject being discussed in the Conference on Disarmament — are attempting to misuse the General Assembly as leverage to prioritize the items on the Conference’s agenda. We believe that the new approach taken by the sponsors will cause the draft resolution on that issue to lose credibility.

We firmly believe that nuclear disarmament is the highest priority on the disarmament agenda, and the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of such weapons. Accordingly, starting negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified timeline should be the highest priority in negotiations on the items on the agenda of the Conference. That programme should include the conclusion of a nuclear-weapons convention in order to legally prohibit, once and for all, the possession, development, stockpiling and use or threat of use of nuclear weapons by any country and to provide for the destruction of such inhumane weapons.

The Islamic Republic of Iran strongly believes that a treaty to ban fissile material for nuclear-weapons 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 must cover past and future production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices and provide for their total destruction.

Mr. Amano (Japan): I would like to explain Japan’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.25. Japan

voted in favour of that draft resolution, as we believe that deepening substantive discussions on ways to increase the effectiveness of negative security assurances is an important issue. However, the draft resolution should not prejudge the discussions in the Conference on Disarmament. Japan strongly hopes that each member State of the Conference will demonstrate its flexibility and that the Conference will break the long-standing stalemate and advance its substantive work on the negotiations of a fissile material cut-off treaty and discussions on other important issues.

Mr. Cassidy (Indonesia): Indonesia would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1. On many occasions, Indonesia has stated clearly that the Conference on Disarmament should advance negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention and negative security assurances, the prevention of an arms race in outer space and a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons in accordance with the Shannon mandate. We cannot overemphasize the importance of considering all of those four issues in a balanced manner.

Indonesia has traditionally been a supporter of the draft resolution that has been introduced by the delegation of Canada in previous years. We lent our support to previous such resolutions, as they clearly emphasized the importance of the Conference commencing negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) within its own framework.

Our delegation is not convinced that some new elements in this year's draft resolution will contribute positively to our common efforts to urge the Conference to meet its obligations as the sole multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament. At this stage, we are not convinced that any issue before the Conference should be taken outside the Conference before 2012. Moreover, we believe that establishing such a deadline for discussing FMCT issues outside the Conference will tip the already delicate balance between the progress made on non-proliferation and on nuclear disarmament issues.

By taking only the FMCT outside the Conference, as mentioned in the draft resolution — as if only certain countries in the Conference lacked the political will to move forward with the process — we see that, regrettably, there are also some countries in the Conference that show a lack of political will to move forward on the issue of nuclear disarmament, negative

security assurances and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. We maintain our position that the Conference lacks political will not only on a fissile material cut-off treaty, but also on the issues of nuclear disarmament, negative security assurances and the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

For those reasons, our delegation decided to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. El Oumni (Morocco): Morocco firmly supports the early negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty in the framework of the Conference on Disarmament. Morocco further underlines that the Member States of the United Nations and members of the Conference should also give equal importance to the other core issues before the Conference, including nuclear disarmament. We call on all States to show political will and flexibility so as to allow the Conference to work on all core issues.

Mr. Kellerman (South Africa): South Africa has supported draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”, on the basis of our long-standing commitment to the commencement of negotiations on such a treaty, which would fulfil both nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation objectives, and not because we subscribe to the notion that a fissile material cut-off treaty is the only item that is ripe for negotiations in the Conference.

We also supported paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, on the basis of our understanding that this option would be but one of the various proposals that could be considered in the First Committee at the next session in the context of revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations.

In addition to the option in the draft resolution, during the course of our deliberations this year many delegations highlighted their wish to address all disarmament issues in a comprehensive manner by convening a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. My delegation views the convening of such a session as an important and viable option to be considered.

While we understand that the draft resolution deals exclusively with only one of the priority issues on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, we

wish to emphasize that South Africa's support for the draft resolution is without prejudice to the priority we attach to nuclear disarmament and negative security assurances, as agreed to in the nuclear disarmament action plan set out in the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)) and to other priority issues on the disarmament agenda, such as the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

We nevertheless remain hopeful that the Conference will be able to overcome its stalemate and commence substantive work on all priority issues during its 2012 session.

Mr. El-Mesallati (Libya) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", for the following reasons.

First, a high-level meeting on revitalizing the Conference on Disarmament, at which the Secretary-General was present, was held in New York on 24 September 2010. It underscored the importance of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating forum entrusted with the consideration of disarmament issues. Moreover, my delegation cannot accept the draft resolution because we seem to be seeking other options for negotiations outside the Conference on Disarmament that will weaken the Conference, which needs our full support in order to establish the appropriate political climate.

Secondly, in accordance with the proposal of the Secretary-General at the high-level meeting in September 2010, Austria, on behalf of a number of countries, submitted a draft resolution on the follow-up to that level meeting. It was adopted by the First Committee and the General Assembly by consensus. My delegation therefore believes that we must emphasize the implementation of that resolution before we seek other mechanisms outside the Conference on Disarmament.

Thirdly, my delegation believes that there is a contradiction between the contents of paragraphs 1 and 2, since paragraph 1 requests the Conference on Disarmament to immediately implement a comprehensive programme of work on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons

or other nuclear explosive devices, while paragraph 2 resolves to consider various options. That would create a duplication of the decisions of the Conference and other proposed mechanisms.

Mr. Zupan (Slovenia): I would like to explain Slovenia's vote with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1 on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

Slovenia has long supported the fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT). For years, we called on the Conference on Disarmament to implement the decision of the 1995 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to start negotiations on that important Treaty, which we believe would bring us closer to a world free of nuclear weapons. In our view, the FMCT would not only do that but would also complement the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. Slovenia is grateful to Canada for doing its best to promote the resolution, which Slovenia has always supported.

As I have pointed out before, the FMCT negotiations should have started years ago. The emotions that surged through our minds would most appropriately be called frustration. That is why Slovenia supported the original paragraph 2 of the first version of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40, presented by the delegation of Canada. In that text, the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to immediately establish a group of governmental experts to identify options, including the necessary legal and procedural requirements, for a treaty to ban the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices on the basis of document CD/1299 and the mandate contained therein.

Slovenia regrets that that part of the text was lost in the process of seeking a compromise regarding draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40. That text would, in our view, provide new impetus for the Conference on Disarmament to start those long-awaited negotiations. Indeed, that text had a game-changing character on the matter. Slovenia knows that and hopes that the Committee will return to the matter at its next session, in a year's time.

Despite that, Slovenia supported much of the draft resolution as it could have been with the original text of paragraph 2.

Mr. Suljuk Mustansar Tarar (Pakistan): I would like to make explanations of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/66/L.15, A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1 and A/C.1/66/L.37.

First, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.15, entitled “2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee”, Pakistan, as a non-party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), neither subscribes to, nor is bound by the conclusions, decisions and follow-on actions of the NPT Review Conferences. We therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

As for draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1, my delegation is in agreement with the assertion in the text that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing processes requiring urgent, irreversible progress on both fronts. However, we are disappointed at the selective and discriminatory language of paragraph 9 that calls upon Pakistan to accede unconditionally to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State.

In accordance with our clear position on the NPT, we can neither accept nor endorse the decisions, recommendations and resolutions emanating from the NPT Review Conferences. Our delegation therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and on paragraph 1, and voted against paragraph 9.

With regard to our vote on the draft text in document A/C.1/66/L.37, over the years Pakistan has consistently supported the objectives of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). We have voted in favour of this draft resolution in the Committee; we voted for the draft resolution this year as well. My delegation continues to believe that the objective of the call in the draft resolution for promoting signatures and ratifications leading to the entry into force of the CTBT will be facilitated when major erstwhile proponents of the CTBT decide to ratify it. Acceptance of the CTBT obligations on a regional basis in South Asia will also help expedite its entry into force.

The draft resolution refers to conclusions and recommendations of the NPT Review Conference. We wish to reiterate that we do not consider ourselves bound by any of the provisions that spring from the NPT Review Conferences or any other forum in which Pakistan is not represented. Therefore, while in the

spirit of flexibility we voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, my delegation was constrained to abstain in the voting on the sixth preambular paragraph.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation abstained from the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.37, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”. Syria will always maintain that such an important and substantive treaty, with all its implications and the future commitment that it requires of all Member States, must not ignore the legitimate concerns of non-nuclear-weapon States, which are the overwhelming majority of countries in the world. Such countries have not been offered sufficient guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, nor do they have access to the peaceful nuclear technology that would enable them to accelerate their development.

The important and fair observations that have been made on the Treaty have reflected the unanimous view that its text does not entail a commitment on the part of nuclear-weapon States to eliminate their nuclear arsenals within a reasonable period of time. It does not explicitly stress the illegitimacy of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, just as it does not stipulate the steps to be taken in order to truly achieve the universality of the Treaty. The text is confined to banning nuclear explosions, but makes no reference to nuclear tests, the qualitative advancement in nuclear weapons or any aspects related to the production of new types of such weapons.

There was unanimous agreement that the verification regime for on-site inspection established under the Treaty could in fact lead to abuses in national data monitoring or control — possibly for political purposes. The strangest thing is that the text of the Treaty authorizes States signatories to it to take measures against non-signatory States, which could include measures adopted by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter. That would be tantamount to a violation of State sovereignty.

My country believes that those shortcomings are fundamental and could be cause for major concern, as Israel is the only party that possesses and develops, quantitatively and qualitatively, nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and refuses to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or to submit its nuclear facilities to

the International Atomic Energy Agency's verification and safeguards regime. All those factors hamper efforts to create a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and expose the region and the world to Israel's nuclear threat, without eliciting any international response whatsoever.

My delegation would also like to express its reservations with regard to all paragraphs of all draft resolutions that have been adopted to date, and those to be adopted, that provide for, or refer to, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

Ms. Rahamimoff-Honig (Israel): We have two explanations of vote but, owing to time considerations, we will deliver only part of our explanation on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and will submit the full version to the Secretariat.

Israel decided to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.37 because of the importance it attaches to the objectives of the CTBT. However, Israel has strong reservations regarding some of the wording in the sixth preambular paragraph and in paragraph 1, and cannot support them. It is Israel's long-standing position that the CTBT and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons are not linked. An attempt to artificially force such a linkage, especially by referring to the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, would jeopardize the CTBT, the global non-proliferation regime and the prospects for better regional security in the Middle East.

Israel's signing of the CTBT, in September 1996, reflected its long-standing policy to bring itself closer, wherever possible, to international norms on nuclear safety, security and non-proliferation. Since the establishment of the Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) in November 1996, Israel has participated actively in the development of all elements of the CTBT verification regime.

In addition, Israel transfers data from its certified seismic stations to the International Data Centre and actively participates in various activities related to on-site inspections. That substantive and intensive involvement demonstrates the importance that Israel attributes to the CTBT and its role with regard to the enhancement of international peace and security.

Israel appreciates the significant progress made in the development of the CTBT verification regime, the completion of which is a prerequisite for the Treaty's entry into force, in accordance with its article IV. However, the completion of the verification regime still requires additional efforts. The major steps required include the continued build-up and testing of the international monitoring system stations, completing the on-site inspections operational manual, purchasing equipment and training.

For Israel, the regional security situation in the Middle East, including adherence to and compliance with the Treaty by States in the region, is a major consideration for ratification. It is Israel's view that the Treaty's verification regime should be robust enough to detect non-compliance with its basic obligations, be immune to abuse and, at the same time, allow each State signatory to protect its national security interests. For Israel, the completion of the verification regime constitutes a major consideration for ratification, as we would like to ensure that there is adequate coverage of the Middle East by the international monitoring system.

In addition, Israel's status in the policymaking organs of the Treaty, including those connected to the geographical region of the Middle East and South Asia and the Executive Council of the future CTBTO must be addressed. Sovereign equality, which is a cornerstone of multilateralism, must be ensured.

As in previous years, Israel voted in favour of the draft resolution. Our voting pattern stems from, and reflects, the importance we attach to the objectives of the CTBT. It is our hope that they will be realized faithfully and in a forthcoming manner.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1, the inherent utility of a fissile material cut-off treaty in addressing the current and growing proliferation challenges, including non-compliance by States with their international obligations in the nuclear domain, is far from proven. That holds especially true for the Middle East, where several States have an exceptionally poor track record of compliance with their nuclear non-proliferation obligations. It has been Israel's long-standing position that the idea of a cut-off treaty is subsumed in the concept of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East — the central prerequisites for which are far from being fulfilled.

Mr. Farghal (Egypt): I take the floor to explain Egypt's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", of which Canada is the main sponsor.

Egypt firmly believes that the Conference on Disarmament is the sole multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament. We therefore oppose any potential encroachment on the Conference or any risk of possible duplication of its work. Egypt believes that the lack of political will is the obstacle preventing the Conference from adopting a comprehensive and balanced programme of work that would address its four core issues equally.

Egypt has always considered a treaty on fissile material as an important and crucial step towards nuclear disarmament, which we consider to be the top priority. In that principled context, Egypt has engaged constructively with the main sponsor of the draft resolution and with other interested delegations, with the objective of meeting the basic requirements to include stockpiles of past production of fissile materials for military uses in any potential fissile materials treaty, with a view to achieving general and complete nuclear disarmament. We had suggested operative language in that direction, reflecting the need for an explicit reference to stockpiles and taking into consideration that the Shannon mandate is the base that allows us to move further in that direction.

However, our suggestions were not adequately taken on board. While we appreciate the positive response to some of our concerns, given the absence of any explicit reference stating that any work on a possible treaty would take place exclusively within the Conference on Disarmament and that it would include stockpiles of past production of fissile materials for military uses, Egypt abstained on paragraphs 2 and 3 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

Nonetheless, Egypt will continue to seek, within the Conference on Disarmament, over which we will have the honour to preside in 2012, the early adoption of a comprehensive and balanced programme of work that would deal with not only a fissile material treaty geared towards nuclear disarmament but also all the remaining core issues on the agenda of the Conference.

Mr. Sparber (Liechtenstein): I am taking the floor to explain the position of my delegation on

several texts dealing with the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1, but we also feel the need to stress our disappointment at the general lack of progress made thus far by the Conference on Disarmament. The initiative of its revitalization last year created a momentum which we very much welcomed but which seems to be ebbing away slowly.

Regarding the draft resolution on the fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) put forward by Canada, we would have preferred to see an earlier version of the text, which called for a governmental expert group in the absence of an agreed programme of work for the Conference on Disarmament in due time. However, we also understand and thus support the concerns of our Canadian friends with respect to aiming for consensus in order to ensure the possibility of progress in FMCT negotiations.

Liechtenstein hopes that, during the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly, different initiatives can be merged in order to create one strong resolution that will carry multilateral disarmament negotiations forward.

Mr. Singh Gill (India): My delegation is taking the floor to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1 and A/C.1/66/L.38.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", India remains committed to the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. We are concerned about the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use or threat of use.

India also shares the view that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing. We continue to believe that a credible, time-bound programme for global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament would be the best and most effective non-proliferation measure.

We voted against the draft resolution and its paragraph 9, since India cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear-weapon State. In urging India to accede to the NPT promptly and without conditions, the draft resolution negates the

rules of customary international law as enshrined in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which provides that a State's acceptance, ratification or accession to a treaty is based on the principle of free consent. 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 global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament.

Turning to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.38, India went along with the adoption of the text without a vote. India respects the sovereign choice of non-nuclear-weapon States to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. That principle is consistent with the provisions of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament as well as with the 1999 Disarmament Commission guidelines referred to in the draft resolution.

India enjoys friendly and productive relations with all countries of the South-East Asian region. We respect the sovereign choice of States parties to the Bangkok Treaty. India, as a nuclear-weapon State, has conveyed an unambiguous assurance that it will respect the status of the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone.

Mr. Jian Shen (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to take this opportunity briefly to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/66/L.41, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons"; A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments"; and A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices".

China has consistently advocated the complete prohibition and total elimination of nuclear weapons, and we support the progressive efforts made to achieve nuclear disarmament and reduce the threat posed by nuclear weapons, with the ultimate goal of building a nuclear-weapon-free world. On that basis, China voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41, on nuclear disarmament.

China cannot, however, support paragraph 9, relating to moratoriums on production, of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", because this is not conducive to the promotion of the early commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT). On that basis, China voted against paragraph 9 and abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

China reiterates that it supports the early commencement of negotiations by the Conference on Disarmament on an FMCT and would like to work towards achieving that goal.

As China supports the purposes and objectives contained in draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1, it has in the past voted in favour. However, we noted with regret that in this year's draft, certain elements are inconsistent with the contents of the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (see NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)). China's view is that as the Final Document was adopted by consensus and was therefore a difficult undertaking, it should not be changed or interpreted in an arbitrary or more generalized manner, and the consensus attained should not be misinterpreted. China therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1.

China has consistently supported the early commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on an FMCT. We therefore voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1. At the same time, we believe that the Conference on Disarmament, as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiations mechanism in which all relevant parties participate, is the only appropriate forum for the negotiation and adoption of an FMCT. Given that paragraphs 2 and 3 are inconsistent with that view, China abstained in the voting on those paragraphs.

All parties concerned should maintain their confidence in the Conference on Disarmament; work hard to improve and strengthen it; and further develop innovative ways to advance the work of the Conference.

Ms. Kennedy (United States of America): I have asked for the floor to speak with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.31/Rev.1, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament

commitments”, sponsored by the New Agenda Coalition. I speak on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and my own Government.

We were unable to support the draft resolution, in part because it does not accurately reflect the commitments contained in the action plan of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We take those commitments seriously and are actively working to fulfil them, as we demonstrated last summer at the Paris conference of the Permanent Five.

We regret that the draft resolution does not reflect an equitable balance among the three pillars of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT): disarmament, non-proliferation and peaceful uses of nuclear energy. It does not adequately address compliance with the Treaty’s non-proliferation obligations and, in particular, neglects to mention the challenge to the NPT regime posed by Iran’s failure to comply with its international obligations. We find that a critical omission.

We were also struck by the fact that it omits any reference to the negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty in the Conference on Disarmament, which the NPT Review Conference endorsed as the next immediate multilateral step towards nuclear disarmament.

While we voted against the draft resolution, we look forward to continuing our contacts with the countries in the New Agenda Coalition on issues of nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

Mr. Magalhães (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation appreciates the efforts of the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1 in introducing changes that allowed us to vote in favour.

Brazil supports negotiations on a fissile material treaty that generally imparts our shared non-proliferation and disarmament goals alike. At the same time, negotiations on such a treaty should not be launched in whatever format under whatever conditions, especially if what is at risk is the future of the Conference on Disarmament as the single legitimate multilateral forum for disarmament negotiations. Furthermore, we should also strive to hold negotiations or substantive deliberations on the other three core issues of the agenda of the Conference,

namely, nuclear disarmament, negative security assurances and the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Therefore, our support for the draft resolution should not be interpreted as encouraging the establishment in the future of parallel mechanisms to the Conference on Disarmament or allowing preparatory technical work to become actual pre-negotiations on a number of fundamental issues of the fissile material treaty, including its scope and verification procedures.

The very fact that this year we have competing draft resolutions on the paralysis in the Conference on Disarmament reinforces our conviction that the best and, ultimately, the effective solution is the convening of a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Under such a special Assembly session, better conditions would be set for a true revision of the United Nations disarmament machinery and for an update of the international community’s common principles and objectives in arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea): Concerning draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”, the delegation of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea voted against it.

During the group consultations on the draft resolution with Canada, the delegation of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea strongly expressed its concern. We all know what that concern is. However, the draft resolution has now been adopted, and that increases that concern. One of the key concerns stated by the delegation of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and the majority of other delegations in the consultations was fear about many things. However, I will talk about just two aspects of the position of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.

First, the draft resolution does not reflect the four core issues. It gives the strong impression that the fissile material cut-off treaty is the only issue on the Conference on Disarmament’s agenda. Each of the other three core issues has its own interest for the appropriate group. Nuclear disarmament is one such issue. It has been on the agenda since the inception of the General Assembly, with the adoption of a

resolution touching on nuclear disarmament in 1946 (resolution 1 (I)). So it is a long-standing and overdue issue that should be negotiated and settled immediately. However, it is still set aside, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shares the common position of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement on nuclear disarmament as a topmost priority.

Secondly, the draft resolution only demonstrates risky attempts by one country — Canada — to remove the fissile material cut-off treaty from the Conference on Disarmament. There is an established practice in the Conference, as the sole multilateral negotiating forum, concerning the principle of consensus and negotiation. Any treaties that have come into existence globally were all negotiated over enough time and a sufficient period of years, but now it is coming to a dangerous stage. If a certain handful of countries removes that issue from the Conference on Disarmament, the disaster that it will cause for everyone is clear.

For one month, at the time of the presidency of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Canada was the only country to boycott the Conference on Disarmament, showing no respect for the rules of procedure. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea only followed the rules of procedure. In that respect, it worked in good faith as President of the Conference. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea strongly believes that the reason for the lack of progress is the lack of political will.

The Chair: I know that some delegations are very frustrated that the explanations of vote take such a long time, but we must all respect that all delegations have the same rights and duties in this multilateral forum. I am certain that explanations of vote are always very important to the delegation making them. We will proceed for a while, and we will see whether we can conclude this evening.

We have now concluded action on cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons".

We will now move on to cluster 4, "Conventional weapons", under which we have one draft resolution and one draft decision.

I now give the floor to the representative of the United Kingdom to introduce draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50.

Ms. Abramson (United Kingdom): I want to introduce the draft decision in document A/C.1/66/L.50, on the arms trade treaty. I do so on behalf of co-sponsors Argentina, Australia, Costa Rica, Finland, Japan, Kenya and the United Kingdom.

Five years ago, the First Committee began its journey towards an arms trade treaty, when we adopted a draft resolution that was subsequently blessed in the General Assembly (resolution 61/89). In that resolution, we asked the Secretary-General to establish a group of governmental experts, which was subsequently transformed into an open-ended working group, given the requirement to have a forum as open, transparent and non-discriminatory as possible in which to take forward the arms trade treaty. Two years ago, we adopted resolution 64/48, with an overwhelming vote of 151 in favour, 1 against, and 20 abstentions.

It is the hope of the sponsors of this decision that it will be adopted without a vote.

Let me very briefly explain why we have presented the decision. Following consultations with the Chair of the Preparatory Committee, Ambassador Roberto Moritán, who explained to us at some length progress so far, we understood that the Preparatory Committee would need two more days to complete its work in February so that we can prepare adequately for the negotiation on the treaty itself in July of next year.

I want to stress that we understand that this decision should have no programme budget implications, but obviously I will leave it to the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs to clarify.

I would like to stress once again that this is five years into our journey and that we have made good progress. It has been a very open, transparent, non-discriminatory process, of which many people have spoken in this room today. We hope that this decision can be adopted without a vote.

Mr. Jorgji (Albania): Albania, together with Norway and Cambodia, has submitted draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

The draft resolution calls upon all States to accede to and implement the Mine-Ban Convention, giving strong focus to the humanitarian dimension of

the Convention. During the 14 years that this resolution has been submitted to the General Assembly, it has received increased support, and last year it reached its highest level of support, with 165 votes in favour, including many countries that are not party to the Mine-Ban Convention.

I would like to reiterate our call to all States, especially those who are not party to the Treaty, to vote in favour of the resolution, thus showing their support for the humanitarian principles of the Convention.

The Chair: Before we proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4 and draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50, I call on representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting.

Mrs. Balaguer Labrada (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As during other 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”, in document A/C.1/66/L.4.

Cuba fully shares the legitimate humanitarian concerns associated with the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines. Our country is a State party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, including its Amended Protocol II, and it complies strictly with the provisions and restrictions that Protocol establishes with respect to the use of mines.

As we indicated earlier, Cuba has been subject for more than five decades to a policy of continuing hostility and aggression by the military super-Power, and our country therefore cannot renounce the use of mines to preserve its sovereignty and territorial integrity, in accordance with the right to legitimate defence as recognized in the Charter of the United Nations.

Cuba will continue to support all efforts that, while maintaining a necessary balance between humanitarian issues and matters of national sovereignty, aim at eliminating the terrible effects of the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines on the civilian population and on the economy of many countries.

The Chair: We will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”, was just introduced by the representative of Albania, today, at this 23rd meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in the document.

There is an oral statement for this draft resolution. I will read out only the relevant parts, concerning its paragraph 9.

In accordance with article 14 of the Convention, the costs of the next meeting of the States parties to the Convention will be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in the meeting, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment, adjusted appropriately.

The Secretariat will prepare preliminary cost estimates for the 12th Meeting of the States Parties for the approval of the States parties at their 11th Meeting. It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions and treaties, under their respective legal arrangements, ought to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations and may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties and States not parties to the convention participating in the meeting.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4 will not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

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, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El

Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Lebanon, Libya, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4 was adopted by 155 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Chair: We will now take action on draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50, entitled "The arms trade

treaty", was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom today, at the 23rd meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in the document.

This decision also has an oral statement, which I shall now read out.

Pursuant to paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 64/48, a fifth session of the Preparatory Committee is to convene in 2012 for up to three days' duration to decide on all relevant procedural matters, including the composition of the Bureau, the draft agenda and the submission of documents, for the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty.

In that regard, and in accordance with the request contained in draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50, the fifth session of the Preparatory Committee would convene for a period of five days, including two additional days over what is stipulated in paragraph 8 of resolution 64/48.

The attention of the Committee is drawn to the oral statement issued on 29 October 2009 in connection with draft resolution A/C.1/64/L.38/Rev.1 (see A/C.1/64/PV.22). It will be recalled that, at the time of the issuance of the oral statement, the conference-servicing costs for the convening of the three-day session of the Preparatory Committee in New York in February 2012 were estimated at \$339,300. In addition, non-conference-servicing requirements — which included overtime, travel of experts and cost of consultants for the substantive servicing of the Preparatory Committee — were estimated at \$31,350.

Subsequently, provisions to cover the above-mentioned requirements have been included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

The request contained in draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50 in connection with the convening of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty in New York for a period of five days, instead of three days, in February 2012 would entail an increase in the requirements for the interpretation and other conference services to cover the additional two days of meetings. Based on more accurate estimates from previous sessions of the Preparatory Committee held in 2010 and 2011, the documentation requirements have been revised, resulting in savings in conference-servicing costs that

would offset the cost of interpretation and other conference services for the additional two days of meetings of the Preparatory Committee, as stipulated in draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50.

The provisions for the implementation of the above request have been considered under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management”; section 4, “Disarmament”; and section 29D, “Office of Central Support Services” in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, 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, 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, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Libya, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.50 was adopted by 155 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now call upon delegations wishing to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. Hajji (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): Morocco, which actively contributed to the preparatory process for the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, voted in favour of the draft resolution on implementation of the Convention, as it has done since 2004, in order to reiterate its support for the Convention’s eminent humanitarian goals. The Kingdom of Morocco remains convinced of the relevance of the humanitarian principles of that international instrument, in particular the protection of civilian populations from the unacceptable damage caused by anti-personnel mines.

Similarly, Morocco’s ratification of Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, in March 2002, and the regular submission, since 2003, of a national report on the implementation of the provisions of that Protocol reflect the Kingdom of Morocco’s participation in the universal momentum for the elimination of anti-personnel mines. Morocco implements the provisions of the Ottawa Convention with regard to mine clearance, the destruction of stockpiles, awareness-raising and training, and

assistance to victims of anti-personnel mines. In that connection, it is fitting to point out the following.

First, between 1 April 2010 and 30 March 2011, the remarkable demining efforts undertaken by the Royal Armed Forces made possible the recovery and destruction of 1,171 anti-personnel mines, 6,799 anti-tank mines and 963 units of unexploded ordnance. Secondly, the Moroccan authorities have assumed responsibility for the treatment of victims and their medical, social and economic rehabilitation. Thirdly, Morocco provides demining support to countries in the region and maintains an ongoing dialogue with non-governmental organizations on achieving the Convention's objectives.

Since 2006, the Kingdom has voluntarily submitted a report under article 7 of the Convention. In the same spirit, Morocco regularly participates in meetings of States parties and in the Convention's review conferences. The adherence of the Kingdom of Morocco to the Ottawa Convention is a strategic objective that is linked to security requirements with regard to its territorial integrity.

Allow me to renew our country's support for the conclusion of an arms trade treaty. Morocco welcomes the progress made in the preparatory work for a conference that will make possible the adoption of the text of such a treaty. Morocco underscores the importance of taking into consideration the positions and legitimate concerns of all States and of ensuring the transparency of the process and full respect for the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Singh Gill (India): We would like to make two explanations of vote, on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4 and draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4, India supports the vision of a world free of the threat of anti-personnel land mines. Since 1997 India has discontinued the production of non-detectable anti-personnel mines and has observed the moratorium on their transfer. India is a party to Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which enshrines the approach of taking into account the legitimate defence requirements of States, especially those with long borders. The availability of militarily effective alternative technologies that can perform the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel land mines in a cost-effective way 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 for 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 Mine Ban Convention, India has participated in all meetings of States parties as an observer. We intend to continue our participation in the meetings of the Convention as an observer, including the forthcoming 11th Meeting of States Parties in Phnom Penh.

We voted in favour draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50, on an arms trade treaty. However, it is our understanding that the discussions in the Preparatory Committee will continue to be without prejudice to, and will not prejudice in any manner, the negotiations at the 2012 United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty. The same holds for any of the papers circulated during the Preparatory Committee meetings, including by the Committee's Chair. As stated by the Chair of the Preparatory Committee himself at this session of the First Committee, "Each of these papers was my personal interpretation of the discussion; they do not bind any delegation".

With regard to the proposed arms trade treaty, my delegation continues to believe that prospects for a viable and effective treaty of universal acceptance will be enhanced only if the interests of all stakeholders are addressed in a consensus-based process — an outcome without artificial deadlines.

Mr. Farghal (Egypt): I take the floor to explain Egypt's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4 and on draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50.

Egypt abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4, on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, due to the particularly imbalanced nature of that instrument, which was developed and concluded outside the framework of the United Nations.

Egypt, having acknowledged the humanitarian considerations that the Ottawa Convention attempts to address, imposed a moratorium on its capacity to produce and export landmines in 1980, long before the conclusion of the Ottawa Convention. Nonetheless,

Egypt views the Convention as lacking balance between the humanitarian concerns related to the production and use of anti-personnel landmines and their legitimate military use in border protection, particularly in countries with long borders.

Furthermore, the Convention does not impose any legal responsibility on States to remove anti-personnel mines they themselves have laid, particularly in their own territories, making it almost impossible for many States to meet their demining requirements on their own. That is particularly true in the case of Egypt, which still has millions of anti-personnel mines — remnants of the Second World War — on its territory. That serious concern is further exacerbated by the weak system of international cooperation set up by the Convention, which is still limited in its effect and highly dependent on the will of donor States.

The Ottawa Convention's weaknesses resulting from its lack of universality are a reflection of the lack of international consensus on its provisions, due in part to its having been concluded outside the United Nations. That reminds us of the value of concluding arms control and disarmament agreements within the context of the United Nations, and not outside of that framework.

Egypt abstained in the voting on draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50, submitted under the agenda sub-item "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms". The draft decision would resolve to hold the final session of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty from 13 to 17 February 2012 in New York, to conclude the Preparatory Committee's substantive work and to decide on all relevant procedural matters.

In paragraph 8 of resolution 64/48, the Assembly resolved to convene a fifth session of the Preparatory Committee in 2012, of up to three days' duration, to decide on all relevant procedural matters of the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty. Our abstention on A/C.1/66/L.50 has nothing to do with the substantive consideration of the matter in the negotiation of the draft treaty; it has only to do with the lack of respect for decisions taken by the General Assembly with regard to the session's scope and duration. Those decisions are necessary elements for the success of our negotiations on this important issue.

Accordingly, Egypt abstained in the voting on the draft decision.

Mr. Suljuk Mustansar Tarar (Pakistan): I will explain Pakistan's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4 and on draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50.

Pakistan abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". Landmines continue to play a significant role in the defence needs of many States, especially those in regions of conflicts and disputes. Pakistan remains committed to pursuing the objectives of a universal and non-discriminatory ban on anti-personnel mines in a manner that takes into account the legitimate defence requirements of States.

Given our security compulsions and the need to guard our long borders that are not protected by any natural obstacle, the use of landmines forms an important part of our self-defence strategy. It is therefore not possible for Pakistan to agree to demands for the complete prohibition of anti-personnel landmines until such time as 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 and militarily effective and cost-effective alternative technologies.

Pakistan is a party to Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, 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.

As one of the largest troop contributors to United Nations-led peacekeeping operations, Pakistan has actively contributed to demining operations in several affected countries in the past. We are prepared to provide training facilities to mine-affected countries. Pakistan enjoys a unique record of having cleared all minefields after the three wars in South Asia. The use of those mines has never caused a humanitarian situation. 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.

With regard to our vote on draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50, since its commencement the arms trade

treaty project has witnessed diverse views from States. That divergence has been manifest in the draft resolution adopted by the First Committee, but also during the three preparatory sessions for the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty.

Pakistan fully shares the concerns that arise from the illegal trade in conventional weapons, particularly those that affect innocent civilians. But the approach being pursued by some States to restrict the scope of the proposed treaty to trading in arms is partial and lopsided.

Unifocal insistence on one dimension and the exclusion of the equally important issues of restraints on production, reduction in armaments and conventional arms control — the proposed parameters and criteria of the arms trade treaty — remain controversial. Those and other aspects of the proposed treaty were discussed in detail in the three sessions of the Preparatory Committee, with substantive agreements remaining unresolved.

The draft decision in A/C.1/66/L.50 refers to the conclusion of substantive work of the next Preparatory Committee session, in February 2012. In our view, that formulation does not accurately capture the factual work. It is our understanding that the next session of the Preparatory Committee will discuss and decide on organizational and procedural issues, not substantive ones. The substantive work was meant for the earlier three Preparatory Committee sessions and the July 2012 Conference, subject to a consensus and a comprehensive treaty on conventional weapons.

Ms. Karim (Singapore): I take the floor to explain my delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4.

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

With that in mind, in May 1996, Singapore declared a two-year moratorium 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.

We also support the work of the Convention by regularly attending the meetings of its States parties.

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 about anti-personnel mines. We will continue to work with members of the international community to seek a durable and truly global solution.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have two explanations of vote.

The first concerns draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4. My delegation shares the humanitarian concerns of the States parties to the Anti-personnel Mine Ban Convention that sponsored the draft resolution. Landmines have been used irresponsibly by military and armed groups in civil wars in some regions of the world, and consequently have claimed a great number of innocent lives, particularly among women and children. We welcome every effort to stop that trend.

However, the Anti-personnel Mine Ban Convention is focused mainly on humanitarian concerns, and does not adequately take into account the legitimate military requirements of many countries, particularly those with long land borders, that use landmines responsibly and in a limited manner to defend their territories. Due to the difficulties of monitoring extensive sensitive areas with established and permanent guard posts or effective warning systems, landmines unfortunately continue to be an effective means for those countries to ensure the minimum security requirements on their borders.

While this defensive device should be used under strict, established rules so as to protect civilians, more national and international efforts should also be made to explore new alternatives to landmines. Likewise, international cooperation should be promoted to speed up mine clearance activities for reducing civilian casualties and to establish sustainable indigenous demining programmes.

While appreciating the objectives of the draft resolution, my delegation, owing to its particular

concerns and considerations, could not support it, and therefore abstained in the voting.

I now turn to draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50. The Islamic Republic of Iran is affected by the challenge of the illicit trade in arms associated with the activities of terrorist groups and drug traffickers backed from outside the country. We have therefore always supported efforts in the framework of the United Nations to combat and eradicate the illicit trade in arms. Despite all differences, Member States, including Iran, have participated constructively in the work of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty.

However, real negotiations on any international instrument must be conducted in accordance with established practices under international law. Exchanging diverse views on some topics is completely different from negotiating a treaty. In our view, developing and maintaining an integrated approach is essential for effectively addressing the negative implications of the illicit trade in arms.

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

Since the proposed arms trade treaty is not a real solution to the problems of developing countries, my delegation does not share the aims of the treaty and, accordingly, opted to abstain in the voting on the draft decision.

Mr. El-Mesallati (Libya) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.4, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”. We did so for a number of reasons, despite sharing the concerns of many States whose representatives spoke about those destructive weapons, especially as my country is dealing with the numerous mines planted throughout its territory during

the First and Second World Wars and by the previous regime, which laid such lethal mines around cities and villages in Libya, killing and injuring thousands of men, women and children.

The Anti-personnel Mine Ban Convention was concluded outside the United Nations. It does not strike a balance between human protection and the use of such mines for security reasons. We feel that the existing international mechanisms have not considered the issue of landmines in an objective and balanced fashion, as the Convention imposes a total ban on such mines in weak countries that are not militarily powerful, thereby depriving them of a simple means of defence. The Convention does not address the harm done to countries in years of destructive war — countries that were occupied and invaded and whose territories were used to wage foreign war and armed conflict.

We also believe that the Ottawa Convention must be reviewed if it is to be a truly accepted instrument, and that it should contain several additional provisions. It should establish a mechanism to assist affected States in removing landmines and remnants of war left in their territories by the major colonial Powers. The Convention should also ban the planting of landmines in the territories of other States and provide for compensation to and rehabilitation of affected States. It should contain provisions for environmental reparations in areas polluted by landmines and other explosive devices. The Convention should totally ban the production and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction before banning landmines. It should also take into account the security and defence issues of some States and their capacity to possess weapons with which to defend their own territory.

Ms. Adamson (United Kingdom): I regret that a vote had to be held on draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50, but I wish to warmly thank all delegations that supported the draft decision. I also wish to clarify, certainly from my national perspective, that the negotiating conference is the negotiating conference; the Preparatory Committee is the Preparatory Committee.

Mrs. Smolcic (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, through you, Mr. Chair, I would like to know from the Secretariat who requested a vote on draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50.

Convinced that the work of the Preparatory Committee has resulted in significant progress towards the planned goal of an arms trade treaty, my delegation voted in favour of draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50. We are also convinced that the new Preparatory Committee session is essential in order to continue to make progress, while we understand that much work remains to be done.

My delegation deeply regrets that the draft decision was not adopted by consensus, since its wording in no way prejudices the outcome of the negotiations, their time frame or the documents submitted by the Chair of the Preparatory Committee.

The Chair: Concerning the question of the representative of Uruguay, the vote on draft decision A/C.1/66/L.50, on the arms trade treaty, was requested by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a point of order.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): There are two issues here that are against the practice of the First Committee.

First is giving the floor to a sponsor of a draft resolution to explain something in the draft resolution, which is contrary to the rules of procedure. Secondly, it is not a practice of the First Committee to bring to the floor the names of countries to say which country requested the voting.

Otherwise, from now on, my delegation would like to know which country requested a vote on each and every draft resolution. Indeed, I will make the request right now, from the floor, to read out the name of the countries that requested voting on the different draft resolutions.

The Chair: On the first issue, concerning the United Kingdom delegation taking the floor to explain its voting on the draft decision that it actually presented, it was, of course, my mistake. I did not have enough time to interrupt the representative when she was speaking.

On the other issue, I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): It has been a long-held tradition and custom of the First Committee not to ask from the floor, as was done in this case, which delegation requested the vote. It has

never been done. But the practice is that when it is done from the floor, we have to divulge the name. It is not a secret, and we have to do it. So we were acting under that tradition of the First Committee.

There is no rule. The rule cannot be found in any rules of procedure. There is no such thing. But, as I said, it is a tradition of the First Committee first not to request, but if the request is made from the floor, we have to answer. Basically, it was a “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy, but it has now been reversed. What can we do?

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a point of order.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have been working in the First Committee for almost 20 years. This is the first time that I have heard a request from the floor to name the country that asked for a recorded vote. It is against the practice. If this is the case, I now formally request that you, Sir, name all the countries requesting votes on all draft resolutions.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of Uruguay on a point of order.

Mrs. Smolcic (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): I see that, involuntarily and in good faith, I have caused a problem. I ask you, Sir, to forgive me. Bearing in mind that every country has the right to request a vote on any draft resolution — as well as the right to know — once again, I asked in good faith. I apologize to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and I promise that I will continue with the practice of the First Committee. I hope that my apologies are accepted.

The Chair: Once again, I give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I appreciate the comment made by my colleague from Uruguay, and I accept the apology. However, I would like to just put on the record that that practice should not be broken again. We should keep to that practice. Otherwise, the First Committee will turn into a game of naming and shaming.

I withdraw my request to name all the countries requesting votes on the different draft resolutions, but I urge that the practice be kept and followed, because it is an issue that maintains the unity of the First Committee.

The Chair: On the issue of keeping the practice, it is known that the practice must be kept by the delegations. The Chair does not have a choice if such a request is made from the floor. We cannot deny the information if such a request is made.

My good intention was to finish our work today, but I have just received a note that the interpreters cannot continue working anymore today. So we will have to continue on Monday morning at 10 a.m.

As of now, the situation is that we have almost concluded cluster 4, "Conventional weapons". There are still two delegations that have not exercised their right to explain their vote. We will continue on Monday morning with the explanations of vote. We

will then proceed to cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security", and cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

Also on Monday, there will be a decision on the timetable and programme of work of the First Committee for next fall. There is a slight change from this year in the paper that representatives have before them, so I ask participants to pay attention to that. We can speak more about that on Monday.

I thank all delegations for their very active participation at this very late hour, and the interpreters for their flexibility.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.