



General Assembly

Sixty-eighth session

First Committee

23rd meeting

Friday, 1 November 2013, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Dabbashi (Libya)

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Agenda items 89 to 107 (continued)

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

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): This afternoon the Committee will be guided by the same procedure I explained yesterday. I trust that all members have a copy of the ground rules of reference, which have been circulated.

We will begin today with the draft resolutions and decisions listed in A/C.1/68/INF.2, which has been circulated among delegations and which contains the remaining drafts from informal paper 1, as well as three new draft proposals that are ready for action today.

Accordingly, the Committee will now resume its consideration of the draft resolutions under cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”, by hearing delegations that had asked to speak in explanation of vote before the voting on this cluster but had not been able to speak by the time we adjourned yesterday.

Mr. Luque (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): Ecuador has voted for every resolution calling for a negotiating process for an Arms Trade Treaty. Unfortunately, we noted that the text that was ultimately adopted by a vote in the General Assembly in April (resolution 67/234) contained some deficiencies, in particular with regard to the imbalance between the rights and obligations of exporter and importer States, the importance of

fundamental principles of international law and their position in the Treaty, the lack of an express prohibition of transfers to non-authorized non-State actors, the lack of an express reference to the crime of aggression, and the possibility that articles related to the criteria could be used as mechanisms for improper political pressure. Likewise, we also deplore the last-minute attempt, in the very final moments of the Conference held in March, to redefine the practice and use of consensus. For those reasons, Ecuador abstained in the voting to adopt the Treaty.

As announced during the explanation of vote of the Ecuadorian delegation at that time (see A/67/PV.71), the authorities of my country intended to continue to study—and in fact are doing so—the text of the Treaty and its implications, in order to take a final decision with regard to signing or adhering to that instrument. In that way, we took note of the text of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 2 April, by means of which States were called upon to consider signing the Treaty. We deplore that such a call to consider signing the Treaty was left out of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4, on which we are about to vote, which would have served to recognize the necessary consideration and prerogative of sovereign States to decide, following the requisite analysis, whether or not to adhere to any international instrument.

For those reasons, my delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4.

Mr. Kim Ju Song (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of the

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.

13-54240 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



Democratic People's Republic of Korea wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.3.

Although our country is aware of all the humanitarian effects of anti-personnel mines, we are not in a position to renounce their use for reasons of national defence and the circumstances under which the Korean peninsula finds itself.

For decades, our country has been protecting its sovereignty and very existence from the military threats caused by the hostile policy of the United States. The United States refuses to join the Ottawa Convention, insisting on the use of mines on the Korean peninsula. More than 1 million active mines are planted in the demilitarized zone.

On several occasions, I have mentioned the military exercises being conducted by the United States every year on the Korean peninsula. In an environment where military tension and threats are our daily lot, with United States troops stationed for more than 60 years in the southern part of the peninsula, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is not in a position to accede to the Ottawa Convention and, as in previous years, will abstain in the voting.

Mr. Seifi Pargou (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my country regarding draft resolutions A/C.1/68/L.3 and A/C.1/68/L.30.

First, on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.3, my delegation shares the humanitarian concerns of States parties to the anti-personnel mines Convention in sponsoring that draft resolution, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". Landmines have been used irresponsibly by military and armed groups during civil wars in certain 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 this threat. However, the anti-personnel mines Convention focuses mainly on humanitarian concerns and does not adequately take into account the legitimate military requirements of many countries, particularly those with long land borders, for responsible and limited use of mines to defend their territories.

Due to the difficulties of monitoring sensitive extensive areas by established and permanent guard posts, or effective warning systems, unfortunately

landmines continue to be an effective means for those countries to ensure the minimum security requirements of their borders. While this defensive device should be used under strict, established rules 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 sustained indigenous demining programmes.

My delegation appreciates the objectives of the draft resolution. However, due to our particular concerns and considerations, we will not support it and therefore will cast an abstention vote.

I should now like to explain the position of my country with regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/68/L.30.

Consistent with our principled position in recent years in advocating a more comprehensive approach towards transparency in armaments, my delegation will abstain on the draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments" contained in document A/C.1/68/L.30.

We have repeatedly stated that transparency in conventional arms without transparency in weapons of mass destruction is imbalanced and lacks comprehensiveness, particularly in the volatile region of the Middle East where the Israeli regime, as the only non-party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, continues developing nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

Resolution 46/36 L, of 9 December 1991, as the main terms of reference for transparency in armaments, has not been fully and faithfully implemented. After more than a decade of the operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, there is only a "recall" of that resolution in the current draft, while it was supposed that the Register would be a first step towards initiating such transparency in all kinds of armaments, including weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons.

My delegation hopes that the General Assembly will in future pursue genuine and comprehensive transparency in armaments, which should include all kinds of armaments, particularly weapons of mass destruction, as recommended by the Group of Governmental Experts.

Mr. Ovsyanko (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): I should like to explain the position of Belarus on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, and draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30, entitled “Transparency in armaments”.

The uncontrolled spread of conventional weapons is a serious threat to peace and security and could have serious impacts for groups of countries, as well as for regions as a whole, which could lead to fanning the flames of armed conflict and the spread of organized crime and international terrorism.

Drawing up a comprehensive document to control the trade in arms — later adopted by the General Assembly in April 2013 as the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) — was a step in the right direction. However, our delegation abstained in the voting. We have many times explained our approach to this matter. Briefly, our view on the ATT is the following.

The Treaty does not fully resolve the issue of the uncontrolled trade in conventional weapons. In our view, the effectiveness of the Treaty will depend very much on the participation of major importers and exporters and on the taking of specific steps to prevent the illegal trade in such weapons, first and foremost by establishing reliable national systems for export control in countries where such systems are absent. Belarus will attentively follow this process and, based on it, will consider its accession to the ATT.

On our overall position with regard to this matter, Belarus will keep to this view during today’s voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4 and a number of paragraphs of draft resolutions A/C.1/68/L.30 and A/C.1/68/L.31.

The Chair: We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.3, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Slovenia at the 19th meeting, on 29 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.3.

With your permission, Mr. Chair, I should like to read out the following oral statement in accordance

with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly concerning the financial implications.

By paragraph 9 of the draft resolution the General Assembly would

“Request(s) the Secretary-General, in accordance with article 12, paragraph 1, of the Convention, to undertake the preparations necessary to convene the Third Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention and, on behalf of the States parties and in accordance with article 12, paragraph 3, of the Convention, to invite States not parties to the Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations, to attend the Third Review Conference as observers”.

In accordance with article 14 of the Convention, the costs of the next Review Conference would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating therein, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately.

The Secretariat will prepare preliminary cost estimates for servicing the 2014 Third Review Conference, for the approval of the States parties at the thirteenth meeting, to be held in Geneva from 2 to 5 December. It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties that under the respective legal arrangements ought to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties and States not parties participating at the meeting.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.3 would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the 2014-2015 biennium.

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, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana,

Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, 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, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Lebanon, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.3 was adopted by 154 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Japan at the 19th meeting, on 29 October 2013. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.4.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4. I shall put those paragraphs to the vote one by one. We shall first take action on operative paragraph 1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern

Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 1 was retained by 137 votes to none, with 27 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former

Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 3 was retained by 136 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint

Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4, as a whole, was adopted by 141 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.9/Rev.1, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mali at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.9/Rev.1 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.2.

In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Eritrea, Ethiopia and Papua New Guinea.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.9/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30 was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the Committee's 19th meeting, on 29 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.30 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Malaysia has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

With your permission, Sir, I should like to read the following oral statement on the financial implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

By paragraphs 6 (b) and 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30, the General Assembly would

"Request[s] the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be convened in 2016, within existing resources, with the broadest possible participation in line with recommendation 76 of the 2013 report of the Secretary-General and on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to prepare a report on the continuing operation and relevance of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, relevant deliberations within the United Nations, the views expressed by Member States and the reports of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, with a view to taking a decision at its seventy-first session";

and

"Request[s] the Secretary-General to implement the recommendations contained in his 2000, 2003, 2006, 2009 and 2013 reports on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development and to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for the Secretariat to operate and maintain the Register".

The operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms has been reviewed by a group of governmental experts every three years. In the past, the General Assembly established expert groups in 2013 by

resolution 64/54, in 2009 by resolution 61/77, in 2006 by resolution 60/226, in 2003 by resolution 56/24 Q, in 2000 by resolution 52/38 R, in 1997 by resolution 49/75 C and in 1994 by resolution 46/36 L.

Pursuant to the request paragraph 6 (b) of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the group of governmental experts would hold three sessions in 2016, two in Geneva and one in New York. It is also envisaged that the membership of the group in 2016 will consist of 20 experts, in accordance with the recommendation in paragraph 76 of the report of the 2013 Group of Governmental Experts (A/68/140).

It is anticipated that the requirements for the travel of the experts, estimated at \$356,000, would be considered in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017 under section 4, Disarmament.

With regard to the request contained in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, the requirements to ensure the continuing operation and maintenance of the Register have been included under section 4, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30 would not give rise to any financial implications.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 67/246, of 24 December 2012, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

The Chair: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6, 6 (a), 6 (b), and 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30. I shall first put to the vote the sixth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin,

Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 134 votes to none, with 36 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote the seventh preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka,

Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 135 votes to none, with 34 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, 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, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 3 was retained by 143 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 4.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey,

Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zambia

Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 147 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 5.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal,

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 5 was retained by 148 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 6.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria,

Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Yemen

Operative paragraph 6 was retained by 145 votes to none, with 26 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 6 (a).

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho,

Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Yemen

Operative paragraph 6 (a) was retained by 144 votes to none, with 27 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 6 (b).

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland,

France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 6 (b) was retained by 146 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 8.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia

(Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Mexico, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Operative paragraph 8 was retained by 150 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, 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, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian

Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30, as a whole, was adopted by 145 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.38, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.38 was introduced by the representative of Colombia at the Committee’s 19th meeting, on 29 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.38 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.3.

With your permission, Mr. Chair, I should like to read out the following oral statement on the financial implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

By paragraphs 5 and 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.38, the General Assembly would decide:

“pursuant to the schedule of meetings for the period 2012 to 2018 agreed at the Second Review Conference, to convene, in accordance with the relevant provision of the Programme of Action, a one-week biennial meeting of States, in New York in 2014 and 2016, and a one-week open-ended meeting of governmental experts in 2015, to consider the full and effective implementation of the Programme of Action and decides to hold the next biennial meeting of States from 16 to 20 June 2014”;

and would also decide

“in accordance with the decision of the Second Review Conference, to hold the Third United Nations Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects in 2018 for a period of two weeks, preceded by a one-week preparatory committee meeting early in 2018”.

Pursuant to paragraph 5, it is envisaged that a one-week biennial meeting of States would be held in New York in 2014 and a one-week open-ended meeting of governmental experts would be held in 2015. In

addition, a one-week biennial meeting of States would be held in New York in 2016.

Pursuant to paragraph 6, the Third United Nations Review Conference on the Programme of Action would be held in New York in 2018, over a period of two weeks, preceded by a one-week preparatory committee meeting in New York early in 2018.

The requirements to ensure the convening of the biennial meeting of States in 2014 and an open-ended meeting of governmental experts in 2015 have been included under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management”, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

The estimated resource requirements in respect of the one-week biennial meeting of States in 2016 and the Third Review Conference in 2018, or its preparatory committee meeting in early in 2018, would be considered in the context of the proposed programme budget for the bienniums 2016-2017 and 2018-2019.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.38 would not give rise to any financial implications.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.38 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.38 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.44, entitled “Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.44 was introduced by the representative of Germany at the Committee’s 20th meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.44 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.3.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.44 was adopted.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I shall now give the floor to delegations that wish to make statements in explanation of position or vote on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. El Oumni (Morocco): Morocco supports transparency in armaments and considers the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms to be a very useful tool. We look forward to further work on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, including the possible extension of its scope.

Transparency in armaments could be instrumental in confidence-building at the international and regional levels. In our region clarity on capacities with regard to weapons of mass destruction and progress in disarmament are equally as important to us as confidence-building measures.

It is in that spirit that Morocco abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30, entitled “Transparency in armaments”, although we do not have any fundamental difficulty with its provisions.

Mr. Aljowaily (Egypt): Egypt abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, as well as on the paragraphs that welcome the adoption of the Treaty on 2 April 2013 and call upon all States that have not yet done so to accede to the Treaty at the earliest possible date. I wish to highlight the following points in explanation of our abstention.

First, the Arms Trade Treaty was adopted by a vote of the General Assembly in April 2013. The vote came after the failure to achieve consensus at the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty on a fair, balanced and robust text that was acceptable to all.

Secondly, the Treaty lacks a number of elements that would have helped to achieve the object and purpose of the Treaty. They include the absence of definitions to important terms and concepts essential for its implementation, the absence of a collective mechanism to identify the applicability of agreed criteria by which an exporter would determine the application of the Treaty, and the lack of a reference to the crimes of aggression and foreign occupation as part of the assessment that would have clarified the implementation process.

The efforts of the international community should continue to fill in the remaining gaps that the Arms

Trade Treaty has left open. We continue to call for addressing the elements of overproduction and the ever-increasing stockpiles of conventional weapons within major arms exporters and producers. We still believe that every effort must be exerted to bring production and stockpiles in major arms-producing States under international scrutiny. International accountability is the only guarantee against the possible abuse of the existing imbalance between major arms exporters and the rest of the world.

Egypt will continue to follow closely further developments regarding the accession to, entry into force and implementation of the Arms Trade Treaty in order to determine our final position on it.

Mr. Seifi Pargou (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to explain the position of my delegation with respect to the draft resolution on the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) (A/C.1/68/L.4).

The Islamic Republic of Iran, as a country affected by the illicit trade in arms associated with the activities of terrorist groups and drug traffickers backed from outside the country, has always been supportive in combating and eradicating the illicit trade in arms. My country constructively participated in the United Nations Conferences on the Arms Trade Treaty and expected the conclusion of an effective, robust, balanced and non-discriminatory treaty aimed at reducing the human suffering resulting from the illicit trade in conventional arms. However, the process was redirected towards narrow national agendas and regional policies, and the draft Treaty fell far short of meeting those expectations. Accordingly, my delegation was compelled to join others in objecting to the adoption of the ATT, in particular for the following reasons.

The ATT failed to incorporate a prohibition on arms transfers to aggressors and foreign occupiers — a clear legal flaw in the ATT. As a victim of an act of aggression in recent history, it is totally unacceptable to us.

The Treaty does not apply to international movements of conventional arms by or on behalf of a State party for its use or the transfer of arms between member States of a military alliance, while such arms transfers in some cases have been used to commit aggression and occupation that have caused human losses and destruction of the infrastructure of a number of countries, including in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf.

The ATT fell short of recognizing the inherent right of States to acquire, produce, export, import and transfer conventional arms, required for the realization of the inalienable right of any State to security, self-defence and territorial integrity.

There is no real safeguard in the Treaty to secure the rights of importing countries, and therefore it is highly susceptible to abuse, politicization, manipulation and discrimination. The ATT does not prevent arms falling into the hands of criminals, illegal armed groups, terrorists and extremist groups. Neither does it ask for a limitation on the production and transfer of conventional arms. The inclusion of parts and components in the Treaty in the absence of any clear definition runs the high risk of equating all simple dual-use goods and equipment with actual conventional weapons.

We abstained in the voting on the draft resolution and two of its operative paragraphs. However, our vote on other draft resolutions that contain a reference to the ATT should not be interpreted as a departure from our position regarding the Treaty and its legal flaws and shortcomings.

In conclusion, I should like to stress that all activities related to the ATT should be financed by the countries advocating the Treaty, not from the regular budget of the United Nations or the assets of this universal Organization.

Mr. Varma (India): India abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.3 and would like to explain its position. India supports the vision of a world free of anti-personnel landmines and is committed to their eventual elimination. The availability of militarily effective alternative technologies that can perform cost-effectively the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines will considerably facilitate the goal of the complete elimination of anti-personnel landmines worldwide.

India is a high contracting party to Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects, which enshrines the approach of taking into account the legitimate defence interests of States, especially those with long borders. India has fulfilled its obligations under that Protocol, inter alia, stopping the production of non-detectable mines, as well as rendering all our anti-personnel mines detectable. India is observing a

moratorium on the export and transfer of anti-personnel landmines.

We have taken a number of measures to address humanitarian concerns arising from the use of anti-personnel landmines, in accordance with international humanitarian law. India remains committed to increasing international cooperation and assistance for mine clearance and the rehabilitation of mine victims and is willing to contribute technical assistance and expertise to that end. India participates in the meetings of the States parties of the Ottawa Convention as an observer and intends to continue to do so in future meetings, including the thirteenth meeting of States parties, to be held in Geneva.

Let me turn briefly to India's position on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4, regarding the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). India participated actively in the negotiations for the Arms Trade Treaty. Underlying India's participation in the extended ATT negotiations was the principle that Member States have a legitimate right to self-defence, and our belief that there is no conflict between the pursuit of national security objectives and the aspiration that the Arms Trade Treaty be strong, balanced and effective. That is consistent with the strong and effective national export controls that India already has in place with respect to defence items.

India expected that the Treaty would make a real impact on illicit trafficking in conventional arms and their illicit use, especially by terrorists and other unauthorized and unlawful non-State actors. India also stressed consistently that the ATT should ensure a balance of obligations between exporting and importing States. However, as India stated at the General Assembly meeting on 2 April at the time of the adoption of the Treaty (see A/67/PV.71), the Treaty was weak on terrorism and non-State actors, which found no mention in the specific prohibitions of the Treaty. Besides, India further pointed out that the Treaty could not be an instrument in the hands of exporting States to take unilateral force majeure measures against importing States without consequences.

Since the Treaty text did not meet our requirements on those counts, India was constrained to abstain in the voting in the General Assembly on a resolution for adopting the Treaty. India is undertaking a full and thorough assessment of the ATT from the perspective of its defence, security and foreign policy interests.

Until that assessment is completed, India is not in a position to take a final view on the Arms Trade Treaty. We therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30, India voted in favour. However, with regard to the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs, our vote was consistent with our approach on the ATT as just mentioned.

Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As at previous sessions, the Cuban delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/68/L.3, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”. Cuba fully shares the legitimate humanitarian concerns associated with the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines. Our country is a party to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, including its Amended Protocol II, and it strictly complies with the prohibitions and restrictions on the use of mines provided therein.

As we indicated previously, for more than five decades Cuba has been subjected to a policy of continued hostility and aggression by the military super-Power. As a result, in order to preserve its sovereignty and territorial integrity, it is not possible for Cuba to renounce the use of mines, in accordance with the right to legitimate self-defence recognized in the Charter of the United Nations. Cuba will continue to support all efforts that maintain the necessary balance between humanitarian and national and security issues and are directed at eliminating the dreadful effects on the civilian population and the economy of many countries of the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines.

Likewise, we add our voice to the call on all States able to do so to provide the financial, technical and humanitarian assistance needed for mine-removal operations and the economic and social rehabilitation of victims.

I shall now read out our explanation of vote with regard to the draft resolutions including references to the Arms Trade Treaty.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, our delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and with regard to operative paragraphs 1 and 3. We did the same with regard to the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30.

We shall do the same with regard to the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.31, related to the issue of the arms trade, owing to the following considerations.

In March, the international community noted the lack of agreement and consensus at the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty. The Conference, in our opinion, provided a historic opportunity to effectively respond to the grave consequences of the illicit unregulated arms trade for many States and peoples throughout the world. But full use was not made of that historic opportunity.

Unfortunately, the agreement to work on this process through consensus was disregarded and a vote was forced on a text that did not respond to the just calls and needs of the international community. Ambiguities, inconsistencies, a lack of definitions and legal gaps characterize the Arms Trade Treaty. It is an unbalanced instrument that favours arms-exporting States, for which privileges are established, to the detriment of the legitimate interests of the rest of the States, including interests in defence and national security. Those interests were favoured to the detriment of the alleviation of human suffering, putting the interests of exporting States above the interests of those countries suffering from the effects of the arms trade.

In conclusion, Cuba will take all measures needed to prevent and combat the illicit trafficking in weapons, to which we remain fully committed.

Mrs. Harbaoui (Tunisia) (*spoke in Arabic*): I make this statement on behalf of the member States of the League of Arab States on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30, entitled “Transparency in armaments”. Member States of the Arab League wish to reaffirm their position on transparency in armaments, in particular with regard to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. For many years, the members of the Arab League expressed their opinion on transparency in armaments by joining the Register. That is based on a clear vision of disarmament, especially with regard to the situation in the Middle East.

The member States of the Arab League underscore the need for transparency in armaments to uphold peace and international security. For the transparency mechanism to be successful, it must follow the necessary guidelines, which should be balanced, transparent and non-discriminatory. Furthermore, they must serve the interests of all States on a national, regional and international basis in accordance with the Register. The first step of the international community towards transparency in armaments must be taken without any contradiction.

More than half of States are not providing information to the Register. We would like to expand the Register, all the more so because, in recent years, experience has demonstrated that these weapons are the only ones on the Register and no further ones are being added. In future, member States of the Arab League will take the necessary measures for transparency. For that to happen, the Register must be expanded beyond conventional weapons and must cover military technologies and applications on a more balanced, non-discriminatory basis, which would make it possible for a larger number of States to participate.

The Middle East region is unbalanced when it comes to armaments. Confidence and transparency can be assured only if the Register is updated to include weapons of mass destruction and nuclear weapons. We must take into account the situation in the Middle East and the occupation of Israel, the only State of the region that is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Despite that fact, Israel continues to disregard calls for it to join the NPT and to place its installations under the International Atomic Energy Agency's negative assurances safeguards regime. It continues to accumulate an arsenal of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction. Because of its belief in its superiority over every other State, it denies the need for transparency. Nevertheless, we need transparency for all weapons, including weapons of mass destruction and nuclear weapons, for arms control to be effective.

For those reasons, the members of the Arab League abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Ms. Park Jee-won (Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.3, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

The Republic of Korea fully sympathizes with the spirit and objectives of the Ottawa Convention and the draft resolution. We believe that important Convention plays, and will continue to play, a central role in alleviating human suffering caused by anti-personnel landmines. However, due to the security situation on the Korean peninsula, we are unable to accede to the Convention at this point and therefore abstained in the voting. Nevertheless, we are committed to mitigating the suffering caused by anti-personnel landmines. The Republic of Korea is exercising tight controls over anti-personnel landmines and has been enforcing an indefinite extension of the moratorium on their export since 1997.

Furthermore, the Republic of Korea joined the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects and its Amended Protocol II and Protocol V on Explosive Remnants of War and is faithfully implementing all the relevant obligations.

The Korean Government has also contributed more than \$8 million since 1993 for demining and victim assistance through the relevant United Nations programmes, including the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Action, an international trust fund for demining and mine-victim assistance. The Republic of Korea will continue to contribute to international efforts for mine clearance and victim assistance.

Mr. Yin Haigang (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to explain its position on the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4.

China accords top priority to addressing regional instability and humanitarian problems arising from the illicit trade in conventional arms, and has always supported and taken an active and constructive part in negotiations on the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and has made its own efforts and contributions to taking forward the negotiations. China has no substantial difficulty with the provisions of the ATT. However, it believes that the Treaty should have been adopted by consensus and does not agree with adopting a multilateral arms control treaty with an important bearing on international and national security by a vote in the General Assembly.

China currently is seriously considering the possibility of signing the Treaty. China voted in favour

of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4, just adopted, to show our support for the objectives and goals of the Treaty. Yet, we would like to place on record our reservation about the adoption of the ATT by way of General Assembly voting.

China stands ready, together with all stakeholders, to continue to strengthen cooperation in our common effort to establish a standardized, well-regulated and rational arms trade order.

Ms. Ramírez Valenzuela (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4, concerning the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), my delegation reiterates its full support for the ATT—a historic achievement of the international community—because it is the first legally binding instrument regulating the trade in conventional arms and preventing their diversion to the illicit market. Mexico is aware that the adoption and signing of the ATT is only the first step towards a responsible trade in arms. We therefore commit ourselves to promote its early entry into force and subsequent effective implementation.

We are aware that involving the parties is the only way to achieve the goals set out in the Treaty. We therefore urge other signatories to take the necessary measures within their national legislations for it to be fully implemented. My delegation believes it would have been desirable for the text of the draft resolution to have included a reference to the provisional application of the Treaty. We deplore the fact that this was not possible. In that vein, Mexico calls on countries to make a statement on the provisional application of the ATT in accordance with article 23, given the the urgent need for its effects to be felt on the lives of our peoples. As one of the eight States parties to the ATT, Mexico reiterates its commitment to advocate the regime that it provides for.

With regard to our abstention on operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30, entitled “Transparency in armaments”, my delegation wishes to recall that the Conference on Disarmament was designed as a multilateral forum for multilateral negotiations on disarmament. Transparency in armaments has been part of its agenda since 1979. However, the Conference has not been able to make any progress either on this or any of the other items on its agenda because it has not adopted or implemented its work programme since 1996, a situation that Mexico deplores. Therefore, the

language of operative paragraph 8 does not reflect reality because it implies that the General Assembly recognizes that the Conference on Disarmament is working on this topic and should continue to do so.

Mr. Luque (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): Ecuador believes that transparency in armaments is an important element in developing confidence-building measures among States. In practice, that has been demonstrated by the reports that my country presented to the Register of Conventional Arms, as well as in the preparation and publication in the framework of the Union of South American Nations, together with other member States of the region, of the South American register on defence spending. It is for that reason that, as we have traditionally done, my country voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30, as a whole, entitled “Transparency in armaments”.

At the same time, my delegation deplores the incorporation of the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs, which refer to the adoption and process of ratification of the Arms Trade Treaty in a fashion that has little relevance to the content and purpose of the draft resolution. We believe that the inclusion of those contentious paragraphs related to the process of ratification and entry into force of an instrument that was not adopted by consensus provides little help to the negotiation process of draft resolutions within the First Committee. For that reason, my delegation abstained in the voting on those two preambular paragraphs.

Ms. Lai Zhenling (Singapore): I take the floor to explain my delegation’s votes in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.3, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”, and draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”.

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

the moratorium indefinitely. We also support the work of the Convention by regularly attending the meetings of the 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 counter-productive.

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

Singapore voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4. We also voted in favour of the earlier resolution 67/234, which adopted the text of the Treaty.

Singapore believes that an Arms Trade Treaty should be practical, effective and based on feasible and implementable obligations, so that it can be universally accepted. Although the Arms Trade Treaty was adopted by the General Assembly in April, Singapore notes that certain articles were introduced late and incorporated into the final text with little opportunity for debate during the Final United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty, held in March. In that regard, Singapore will need more time to study the Treaty obligations.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): I beg your indulgence, Sir, and the indulgence of my colleagues, because I have to speak on four draft resolutions.

First, on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.3, my delegation abstained in the voting. Landmines continue to play a significant role in the defence needs of many States, especially those in regions of conflict 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 requirements and the need to guard our long borders not protected by any natural obstacle, the use of landmines forms an important part of our self-defence strategy. As such, it is not possible for us to agree to the demands for a complete prohibition of anti-personnel landmines until such time as viable alternatives are available. The objective of the total elimination of such mines can best be promoted,

inter alia, by making available non-lethal, militarily and cost-effective alternative technologies. Pakistan is party to the Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, 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.

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

Pakistan voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4, on the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), as a demonstration of our solidarity with the peoples of States negatively impacted by the unregulated and illicit trade in conventional arms, particularly small arms and light weapons. Having said that, we share the concerns expressed by delegations at the decision to adopt by a vote multilateral treaties that have a direct bearing on the legitimate self-defence needs and interests of States. We also strongly disagree with attempts to reinterpret the principle of consensus.

We wish to highlight once again some of the key aspects to which Pakistan repeatedly drew attention during the negotiations, although those points were not taken on board.

First, arms acquisitions by States motivated by security needs can hardly be separated from their production and sales, which are driven by commercial and political considerations. The Treaty text ignores the vital element of excessive production, which is an inseparable component of the entire chain of the international trade in conventional arms. The trade and transfer aspect of conventional arms cannot be divorced from their production and bottom lines. That, in our view, is a serious omission that may impact the Treaty's effectiveness over the long run.

Secondly, the Treaty may be seen by many as essentially a product of and by exporters only. It may be perceived as not striking the necessary balance of interests and obligations among exporters and importers, as well as the affected States.

Thirdly, the Treaty glosses over two lacunae, including the absence of definitions. That omission represents a departure from established treaty practice. Such a deviation may be used by some exporters to circumvent the provisions of the Treaty. The multiplicity of national definitions goes against the central objective of the Treaty, that is, establishing the highest common international standards.

With regard to the lack of accountability on the part of exporters, although the text lists a few obligations for exporters, it does not provide a clear mechanism for their accountability in the event of violations of the ATT provisions, particularly those related to the laid-down criteria. Such a lack of oversight could reinforce the perception that the Treaty is unfairly tilted towards exporting States.

Pakistan's interministerial mechanism continues to examine and evaluate the Treaty's provisions in several aspects. We hope that the ATT review process will address the concerns I have outlined here. Such a course correction would be key to promoting the effectiveness and universality of the Treaty.

On draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30, entitled "Transparency in armaments", Pakistan supports the broader objectives of pursuing transparency in armaments, including military expenditures. Such measures have the potential to serve as early-warning systems to assess global armament accumulation trends and as a potential force that ought to put some moral pressure on States responsible for destabilizing arms transfers, production and stockpiles.

However, there can hardly be a one-size-fits-all approach for all regions or subregions. For transparency measures to gain broader traction and acceptability, a recognition of the different political and security conditions in various regions is essential. Such measures also need to be pursued in tandem with others, such as confidence-building measures and efforts to ease tensions and resolve conflicts through negotiations, dialogue and mediation. The intended results of such measures would have less value if they were to be promoted as an end in themselves.

The ultimate objectives should be to seek restraints, promote confidence-building measures, ease extensions and resolve disputes at the regional, subregional and global levels. We need to assess also the downward trend in reporting and its potential correlation with the perceived limited ability, or lack of a clear path, to broader goals of confidence-building and conflict resolution.

We support the establishment of new groups of governmental experts. However, we also share the broad expectation that their composition — and, indeed, that of all groups of governmental experts established within the United Nations in the field of disarmament — should strictly conform to the principle of equitable geographic representation, particularly from developing countries. We recognize the financial constraints being faced by the United Nations system, but they should not limit opportunities for participation, particularly from diverse regions and perspectives.

Finally, on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.44, we agree with the draft resolution's key goal of developing a comprehensive and integrated approach to disarmament through practical measures. Pakistan itself has worked towards the associated goal of promoting conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels. Notwithstanding current difficulties, the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe represents a good model of a comprehensive approach. We would like to highlight the following points with respect to the draft resolution.

The largest stockpiles of conventional armaments are maintained by major and militarily significant States. They should therefore take the lead in assessing surplus stockpiles and their safe disposal. Such efforts would be supplemented by action at the regional and subregional levels to prevent excessive accumulation and imbalances in conventional armaments and military forces. Finally, while it may not be possible to have a universal definition of surplus stockpiles of armaments or their ammunition, some general guidelines could be evolved on the basis of previous work done under the auspices of the United Nations.

Ms. Pepin-Halle (Canada) (*spoke in French*): Canada takes the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty", and on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30, entitled "Transparency in armaments". Canada voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30 as we support

initiatives to promote transparency in armaments at the regional and international levels.

With respect to the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), Canada believes that the noble goal of stopping the irresponsible and illicit trade in small arms and light weapons that fuel terrorism, organized crime and armed conflict is indeed important. We continue to work to ensure that such weapons do not fall into the hands of criminals, terrorists and all those who violate human rights. We already apply certain standards for exports, which are among the highest in the world. While continuing to attempt to stop the illicit flow of illegal weapons, it is very important that the Treaty not affect legitimate and responsible firearms owners, or that it be an obstacle to the legitimate and legal international transfer of conventional weapons. We must bear in mind that weapons have legitimate uses, and a legitimate trade in them therefore exists.

Canada takes the necessary time to consult with the national stakeholders concerned to ascertain their views on the Treaty. We want to reassure them that the Treaty will not be an undue burden on legitimate firearms possessors in Canada, including farmers, hunters, sports shooters and collectors.

Mr. Kim Ju Song (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): We would briefly like to reaffirm our position regarding draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.4, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty".

As previously mentioned by other countries, the Treaty does not reflect a fair and balanced context, undermining the national security environment of countries. It seems that the current draft resolution would greatly contribute to world peace and security and set legal standards for the arms trade worldwide. On the other hand, with this draft resolution, more intervention of large arms dealers would result in more chaos, conflict and human suffering, while providing uncountable benefits to major arms-exporting countries, leading them to interfere under a legal framework in major world conflict areas.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a peace-loving country like no one else, and in the spirit of full support for a fair and balanced treaty, therefore we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. Toro-Carnevali (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My country voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.44, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of

conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus", because we believe that ammunition constitutes an integral part of the problem of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons.

The measures taken to prevent, combat and eliminate this kind of trade cannot be comprehensive without including the issue of ammunition. The Antigua declaration adopted in May 2006 recognizes that the trade in ammunition is intrinsically linked to the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons.

Venezuela also believes that marking ammunition before exporting or transferring it would make it possible for it not to be diverted to groups acting outside the law. It is therefore a crucial aspect in the fight against the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.30, entitled "Transparency in armaments", my delegation abstained in the voting on the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs. That abstention by no means puts into question the need for transparency linked to confidence-building measures in security, which Venezuela supports. To the contrary, our abstention is a rejection of the addition of the specific controversial element of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), which undermines the purpose and scope of the proposals under discussion. Should the authors of the draft resolution have agreed to use more moderate language and take into account the concerns of a major group of countries with regard to the ATT, my delegation would have been able to support the draft resolution, as it always has done with similar resolutions in previous years.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting on the draft resolutions and decisions included under cluster 4.

The Committee will now proceed to consider cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security". Before we proceed to take action on the draft decisions and resolutions, I shall give the floor to the delegation of Cuba, which wishes to make a general statement or to introduce new or revised draft resolutions.

Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Under the consideration of this group of issues, we wish to indicate a general concern at the proliferation of initiatives with regard to the establishment of experts groups of limited membership to consider issues of

disarmament and arms control, which are extremely sensitive and are of interest to all Member States. We believe that the setting up of such limited groups should be the exception rather than the rule and that, instead, transparent and inclusive processes should be adopted whereby all Member States can consider those important topics on an equal footing in the framework of the bodies of the disarmament machinery of the United Nations.

Furthermore, when it comes to the proposals contained in draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.45, entitled “Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures”, we first wish to highlight the fact that our delegation shares the concern about the fact that military expenditures continue to increase — rising to \$1.75 trillion in 2012 — in an international environment marked by economic crises and reduced public spending. We reiterate our call for the establishment of a United Nations fund to which at least half of current spending on military expenditures would be devoted in order to respond to the need for economic and social development in countries in need.

With regard to the proposals in the draft resolution, we do not believe it is necessary to set up an experts group on this topic. The most recent experts group made numerous recommendations, many of which have not been implemented by many States or even considered. In principle we are not opposed to periodically reviewing the standardized reporting through an inclusive mechanism within the framework of the General Assembly or the Disarmament Commission or in any other body. But we do not support the use of the mechanism of a closely restricted experts group for this where there is little evidence as to its effectiveness and, moreover, it has proved to be an extremely costly approach, as we heard, given the thousands of dollars that could be used on other areas of high priority.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft decisions and resolutions under cluster 5.

(*spoke in English*)

The Committee will first take action on draft decision A/C.1/68/L.22, entitled “Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft decision was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee’s 20th meeting, on 30 October. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/68/L.22.

The Chair: The sponsor of the draft decision has expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/68/L.22 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.31, entitled “National legislation on transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the Committee’s 19th meeting, on 29 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/68/L.31.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. Separate recorded votes have been requested on the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.31. I shall first put to the vote the seventh preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, 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, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 156 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea,

Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, 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, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

The eighth preambular paragraph was retained by 158 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cape Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo,

Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, 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, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nicaragua, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Operative paragraph 1 was retained by 157 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.31, as a whole. 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, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.31, as a whole, was adopted by 171 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.45, entitled "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Romania at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.45 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.3.

With your permission, Mr. Chair, I should like to read out the following oral statement on financial implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

By paragraphs 7, 7 (c) and 7 (h) of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.45, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, within available resources,

"[t]o establish a group of governmental experts, on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to review the operation and further development of the United Nations Report on Military Expenditures, including the establishment of a process for periodic reviews in order to ensure the continued relevance and operation of the Report, commencing in 2016, taking into account the views expressed by Member States on the subject and the reports of the Secretary-General on objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures, and to transmit the report of the group of experts to the General Assembly for consideration at its seventy-second session;"

and

"[t]o promote international and regional/subregional symposiums and training seminars and to support the development of an online training course by the Office for Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat, with the financial and technical support of interested States, with a view to explaining the purpose of the standardized reporting system,

facilitating the electronic filing of reports and providing relevant technical instructions".

The first group of governmental experts to review the operation of the United Nations Report on Military Expenditures was established in 2010, pursuant to resolution 62/13. In paragraph 74 of its report (A/66/89), the group recommends that the operation of the Report on Military Expenditures be reviewed every five years. A process for periodic review was also recommended by the General Assembly in resolution 66/20.

Pursuant to the request in paragraph 7 (c) of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the group of governmental experts will hold three sessions, two in Geneva and one in New York, in 2016 and 2017. The conference servicing for the three sessions of the group of governmental experts has been estimated at \$408,215 at current rates. In addition, non-servicing requirements, including the travel of experts, have been estimated at \$366,800. Those requirements would be considered in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017 under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management", and section 4, "Disarmament", respectively. The requirements for the activities envisaged under paragraph 7 (h) would be financed from extra-budgetary resources provided by interested States.

With regard to paragraph 7, which requests the Secretary-General, within available resources, to implement the activities called for in paragraphs 7 (c) and 7 (h), the attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the most recent of which is resolution 67/246, in which the Assembly reaffirms that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.45 would not give rise to any financial implications.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.45 was adopted.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I shall now give the floor to delegations wishing to take the floor in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. Luque (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): Ecuador believes States should improve their legislation and procedures with regard to the transfer of weapons, military equipment and dual-use good. For that reason, as in previous years, my delegation supported the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.31, as a whole.

At the same time, my delegation deplores the inclusion of the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs, which refer to the Arms Trade Treaty, as well as the mention of that instrument in paragraph 1. The inclusion of the preambular paragraphs does little, and did little, to encourage the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution by mentioning a treaty that in itself was not adopted by consensus.

The reference made to the Arms Trade Treaty in paragraph 1 is, at the very least strange, as it calls on States to comply with their obligations under international conventions such as the Arms Trade Treaty. That is so, first of all, because it is inherent in international treaty law for States to bind themselves to comply with the provisions in instruments to which they are parties; but all the more so when the only express reference is to a treaty that has still not entered into force.

A similar resolution was adopted by consensus two years ago, during the sixty-sixth session. Now it has been adopted by a vote. How deplorable that is. How can we continue to try to adopt a resolution by consensus when it contains references to an instrument that only seven months ago was not adopted by consensus because of a lack thereof?

Mr. Hassan (Sudan) (*spoke in Arabic*): I have asked for the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.31, entitled "National legislation on transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology".

The Sudan affirms in principle the importance of national control of such materials and dual-use goods. The Sudan also underscores the importance of the existence of national laws to ensure that such items are not transferred to unauthorized parties. However, we do not want constraints that could be used by some

people in order to stop the use of such materials for useful purposes in developing countries.

In paragraph 1, the draft resolution adopted today refers to a unanimous resolution of the Security Council with regard to certain measures concerning arms. The Sudan has certain reservations concerning the work of expert groups set up by the Security Council in the area of disarmament and related measures and procedures. The draft resolution therefore includes certain principles that we are not against in principle, for we support the exchange of information concerning technology and peaceful uses. But that should be on the basis of transparency and equality and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions to which we are parties. The draft resolution adopted today refers in its operative paragraph 1, on which we have reservations, to the Arms Trade Treaty on which we have certain known reservations and on the way the resolution was adopted.

For those reasons, the delegation of the Sudan abstained in the voting on the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraph 1, even though we support the rest of the draft resolution.

Mr. Vipul (India): I take the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.31. We voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because we support its overall objectives. But we abstained in the voting on the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraph 1, as they make references to the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). That is consistent with our approach on the ATT, which I should like to recall briefly.

India participated actively in the negotiations on the ATT, in the expectation that such a treaty would make a real impact on illicit trafficking in conventional arms and their illicit use, especially by terrorists and other unauthorized and unlawful non-State actors. During the ATT negotiations, India consistently stressed that the treaty should ensure a balance of obligations between exporting and importing States. However, the finalized treaty text did not meet our requirements on those counts. We are undertaking a full and thorough assessment of the ATT from the perspective of our defence, security and foreign policy interests. Until that assessment is completed, India is not in a position to take a final view on the ATT.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation supported draft

resolution A/C.1/68/L.31. However, we should like to draw the attention of its sponsors, and that of the entire First Committee, to paragraph 1, which makes reference to Security Council resolution 1540 (2004).

We all know that resolution 1540 (2004) exclusively deals with weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery and weapons-of-mass-destruction-related dual-use goods and technology. Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.31 deals with conventional weapons, and therefore does not deal with the categories dealt with in resolution 1540 (2004). We think that that resolution and the reference to it in draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.31 are inappropriate. In our view, it would be better to reference paragraph 1 of the draft resolution on confidence and trust-building measures.

The situation concerning this draft resolution, including its drafting, is well known. We shared ideas with the authors of draft resolution in a timely manner. However, we received no explanation as to why the reference to resolution 1540 (2004) was retained in draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.31. Nevertheless, we request that the drafters address this situation and, when presenting this draft resolution next year, change paragraph 1 or provide some kind of justification of why it includes a reference to resolution 1540 (2004).

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): My explanation of vote is with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.45. Pakistan favours efforts aimed at promoting transparency in armaments generally, including through reporting on military expenditures, exports and imports of military equipment, and procurement through national means. However, transparency is a means to an end, not an end or a policy pursued of itself. The ultimate goal of such efforts should be aligned with the broader goals of confidence-building, the mitigation of tensions and the resolution of conflicts through dialogue and mediation.

Pakistan has supported the resolutions on this subject, including resolution 66/20, adopted two years ago. However, our decision on furnishing information regarding military expenditures is guided by the following considerations.

Given the huge disparity between the military expenditures of major Powers and other countries, the initiative for reduction of military expenditures should come from States with the largest arsenals. Reductions should be done in a manner that does not upset the military balance, either globally or regionally. To maintain the equilibrium, it would be more equitable

to link the reduction of expenditures with the clearly specified reduction of military personnel and hardware.

Apart from technical difficulties, the success of the concept ultimately will be determined by conflict resolution and the creation of confidence among States. We look forward to contributing to the work of the group of governmental experts and hope to make a meaningful contribution.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting on the draft resolutions under cluster 5.

The Committee will now move on to draft resolutions under cluster 6.

I give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Seifi Pargou (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation will not participate in the Committee's action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.19, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

Given the continued crisis in the occupied territories of Palestine and the imposition by the Israeli regime of its severe blockade, including from the Mediterranean, on the people of the Gaza strip, the draft resolution does not factually reflect the situation in the occupied territory, and therefore is far from the reality in the region.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.19, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.19 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.3.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.19 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.50, entitled “Regional disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee’s 21st meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.50.

The Chair: The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.50 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.51, entitled “Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee’s 21st meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.51 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.3.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.51 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.52, entitled “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee’s 21st meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.52.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.52. I shall put that paragraph to the vote first.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, 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 Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bhutan, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, San Marino, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 140 votes to 1, with 34 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.52, 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, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, 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, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania,

United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.52, as a whole, was adopted by 174 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I shall now give the floor to delegations that wish to explain their positions or votes on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Ms. Ramírez Valenzuela (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): As on previous occasions, my delegation has decided to abstain on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.52, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels". As we have done previously, we reiterate to members our concern at this paragraph for the following reasons.

On the one hand, my delegation believes that the development of principles for the control of conventional arms goes beyond the competence of the Conference on Disarmament, not only because of the subject matter but also because it does not fit within the negotiating mandate of the Conference. The Disarmament Commission should be the body to consider this issue, given its deliberative nature.

My country believes that the paralysis in the work of the Disarmament Commission, as well as its current working methods, makes it unviable to add another topic to the work of that forum as expressed in the operative paragraph under consideration.

Mr. Vipul (India): I take the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.52 and its operative paragraph 2. India voted against the draft resolution, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels", and its operative paragraph 2, which requests the Conference on Disarmament to consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control.

The Conference, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has a vocation for negotiating disarmament instruments of global application. In 1993, the United Nations Disarmament Commission adopted by consensus guidelines and

recommendations for regional disarmament. There is no need, therefore, for the Conference on Disarmament to engage itself in formulating principles on the same subject, at a time when it has several other priority issues on its agenda.

Furthermore, we believe that the security concerns of States extend beyond narrowly defined regions. Consequently, the notion of the preservation of a balance in defence capabilities in the regional or subregional context is unrealistic and unacceptable to our delegation.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation, as in past years, had to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.52. Our position has not changed. We think that the work done by the authors of the draft resolution in this area is useful. The draft resolution itself is also balanced. However, we are not pleased with the ongoing — every year — and absolutely inappropriate reference to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe.

That obsolete Treaty from the era of the Cold War and its preamble for some reason continue to be called the cornerstone of European security. However, the majority of interested States for some time now clearly understand the necessity of drawing up new, non-discriminatory agreements to replace the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe.

Russia, consistently and determinedly, has called for the establishment of authentic partnerships among all European States based on the principle of equitable, unified and undiminished security. We call upon the drafters and supporters of the draft resolution not to distort the true state of affairs regarding the control of force in Europe and not induce into error those who do not have a good understanding of the topic. We hope that in the drafting of the analogous draft resolution at the forthcoming sixty-ninth session, there will no longer be any distortions and at that time we will be able fully to support that document.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting on draft resolutions under cluster 6.

The Committee will now move on to cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”. I shall now give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements on cluster 7.

Mr. Van der Kwast (Netherlands): I take the floor, as a follow-up to resolution 66/66, on behalf of South Africa, Switzerland and the Netherlands in connection with draft decision A/C.1/68/L.24, entitled “Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”.

At the sixty-sixth session, Switzerland, South Africa and the Netherlands presented the resolution on revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations. The resolution was adopted by consensus by the Committee, and subsequently by the General Assembly as resolution 66/66.

The resolution was informed by the range of concerns expressed by the international community regarding the lack of progress in the relevant disarmament forums. Its main aim was to unite all States Members of the United Nations on the need to revitalize the work of the multilateral disarmament machinery, including the Conference on Disarmament, and to take forward multilateral disarmament negotiations. The resolution encouraged States to build on the work that had already been undertaken and to explore, consider and consolidate options, proposals and elements for revitalization.

Last year, taking note of the discussions on the revitalization of the Conference that had taken place in the CD and of the different initiatives being pursued in the First Committee that were directly or indirectly related to the work of the CD, the authors of resolution 66/66 elected to introduce a decision to include this term on the agenda of the sixty-eighth session of the First Committee.

This year we have noted some encouraging developments regarding the revitalization of the work of the CD, reflecting the growing importance that Member States accord to the issue. That is illustrated by the continuation and deepening of discussions on the revitalization of the CD in 2013. It is also demonstrated by the extensive efforts undertaken by the Presidents of the CD to secure agreement on a programme of work. It is reflected in the proposals made by the Secretary-General to the Conference and Member States that led to the CD’s decision to establish an informal working group to produce a programme of work. We welcome that decision and are committed to work with others for a programme of work that is indeed robust in substance and progressive over time.

We also duly take note of other proposals to address the working methods of the CD and its membership. We urge CD member States to intensify their efforts to take the revitalization process forward in 2014.

We are also encouraged by the advancement of a number of initiatives related to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, giving a new impetus towards the achievement and maintenance of a nuclear-weapon-free world. As such, we believe that those initiatives serve only to strengthen the work of the CD. They include the growing concern expressed by States about the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons. They also encompass the open-ended working group on taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations, coupled with the high-level meeting on nuclear disarmament.

Notwithstanding those encouraging developments, it is clear that much more remains to be done. We see an urgent need to intensify further efforts to revitalize the work of the CD and the United Nations disarmament machinery. The current deadlock has for too long prevented the CD from fulfilling its task, in particular to take forward nuclear disarmament, serving to undermine its credibility. It is our hope that the initiatives I have referred to will be taken forward.

As the authors of resolution 66/66, we have carefully considered those various developments. We have decided not to submit a follow-up draft resolution at this year's session, but to introduce a decision to include this item on the agenda of the sixty-ninth session of the First Committee. We will closely monitor progress towards the revitalization of the CD and the United Nations disarmament machinery. We will continue to advocate for progress to that end. We stand ready to engage with all delegations on revisiting the implementation of resolution 66/66 next year.

Finally, it is our hope that this draft decision will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. Seifi Pargou (Islamic Republic of Iran): The Islamic Republic of Iran reaffirms the importance attached by the Charter of the United Nations to the principle of the equality of all States and equitable geographical distribution. Taking into account the importance of groups of governmental experts in the field of disarmament and international security, my delegation emphasizes the need to give due consideration to the appointment of the members of such groups and also to equitable geographical representation.

While expressing concern at the regional imbalance and inadequate underrepresentation of developing countries in the current composition of the membership in some groups of governmental experts, we consider that mere reflection of the principle of equitable geographical representation in the resolutions establishing such groups is not sufficient.

Accordingly, Iran underlines the need for the strict application of such principles in the actual composition of those groups, so as to ensure more balanced membership. My delegation urges the Secretary-General to take concrete action to ensure more balanced membership in future groups, which can contribute to the effectiveness and participatory nature of their work.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): Before proceeding to take action on draft decisions and resolutions under cluster 7, I give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Seifi Pargou (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation will join the consensus in adopting the draft resolutions on the United Nations Regional Centres in Latin America and in Africa (A/C.1/68/L.33 and A/C.1/68/L.47), as well as the draft resolution on the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa (A/C.1/68/L.53), based on the understanding that all measures, references and concepts contained in such draft resolutions are applicable only to the countries in the regions concerned.

While dissociating itself from any reference in those draft resolutions to ammunition and explosives, armed violence, the Arms Trade Treaty and Security Council resolution 1325 (2000), my delegation would like to put on record that those references should not set a precedent for their inclusion in future in other draft resolutions and decisions of the First Committee, or the scope of the issues or outcome documents of the other disarmament forums such as meetings related to the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.5, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Malta on behalf of members of the Bureau of the Disarmament Commission at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/68/L.5.

The Chair: The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.5 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/68/L.24, entitled "Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft decision was submitted by the delegation of Switzerland and introduced today by the representative of the Netherlands. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.24.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft decision have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/68/L.24 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.25, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Nepal at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 23 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.25 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.3.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.25 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.27, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Ireland at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 24 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/68/L.27.

With your permission, Sir, I should like to read out the following oral statement on the financial implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.27, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General

"to continue to ensure and to strengthen, if needed, the provision to the Conference on Disarmament of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services".

It is recalled that the resources for substantive and secretarial support of the Conference on Disarmament are included under section 4, "Disarmament", and the resources for conference servicing are included under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

Subject to decisions taken at the 2014 session of the Conference on Disarmament to establish its programme of work for 2014 and to establish any subsidiary bodies for its implementation, the strengthening of all the necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services to the Conference as requested in paragraph 8 of the draft resolution may entail additional resource requirements under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

The established procedures on the preparation for a statement of programme budget implications would be followed as necessary in the context of actions taken by the Conference on Disarmament.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.27 would not give rise to any programme budget implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 at this time.

The Chair: The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.27 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.47, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States at the Committee’s 18th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.47 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.3.

With your permission, Sir, I should like to read out the following oral statement on financial implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 10 and 11 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.47, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General

“to continue to facilitate close cooperation between the Regional Centre and the African Union, in particular in the areas of disarmament, peace and security”;

and

“to continue to provide the Regional Centre with the support necessary for greater achievements and results”.

The implementation of the request in paragraph 10 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

With regard to paragraph 11, the provisions under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 include one P-5 post, one P-3 post, one GS-7 local-level post and general operating expenses. The programme activities of the Regional Centre would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 67/246, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirms the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.47, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.47 was adopted.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to delegations that wish to explain their positions on the draft resolutions or decision just adopted.

Mr. Seifi Pargou (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation joined the consensus regarding the draft resolution on the Report of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) (A/C.1/68/L.27). We strongly believe that the CD is and should remain the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating body, as there is no alternative. It should be fully supported, which is of course a shared objective and a common responsibility.

Based on existing methods of work and rules of procedure, the CD has formulated landmark universal instruments in the past. That proves not only its relevance but the efficiency and effectiveness of its rules of procedure, in particular the rule of consensus. Therefore, the main difficulty in the CD lies in the lack of genuine political will by some States to make progress, particularly on nuclear disarmament. Instead of blaming the consensus rule for its current stalemate, the total blame should be put on countries that consider that body to be a single-issue venue.

In such circumstances, neither changing the rules of procedure of the CD nor the proliferation of resolutions and the putting forward of unworkable proposals to deal with highly sensitive disarmament issues is a wise solution. We have always supported the reactivation of the CD based on a balanced and comprehensive

programme of work and full observance of its rules of procedure.

My delegation is of the view that the Conference on Disarmament should be responsive to the priorities and security concerns of all States, not just some. We do not share the view that the decision in 2009 that is reflected in this draft resolution was a balanced and comprehensive programme of work. However, we joined the consensus in the CD in that year for the sake of showing flexibility.

In 2013, the Islamic Republic of Iran assumed the presidency of the CD from 27 May to 23 June. Since the beginning of our presidency, we have reiterated that overcoming the current situation in the CD was a common responsibility. We were fully aware of the complexity of the issue. However, that difficulty did not discourage us from making the utmost effort. We consulted intensively with every group of Member States at various levels to reach consensus on a balanced and comprehensive programme of work. Our proposal

was based on the innovative efforts of past Presidents of the CD in trying to simplify and streamline the programme of work and to treat all core issues equally with respect to method and modality.

No delegation formally opposed the proposal. However, as some delegations were hesitant to agree with the draft decision, we refrained from officially introducing it to avoid another failure that might undermine the credibility of that body.

I should like to take this opportunity to express our sincere gratitude to all CD members who supported our initiative. As an active member, the Islamic Republic of Iran will continue to support a balanced and comprehensive programme of work to overcome the current stalemate in the CD. In our view, the existence of nuclear weapons is the greatest threat to the security of all nations. Accordingly, the CD should consider negotiations on nuclear disarmament as its highest priority.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.