



General Assembly

Sixty-fifth session

First Committee

22nd meeting

Friday, 29 October 2010, 10 a.m.
New York

Chair: Miloš Koterec (Slovakia)

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

Agenda items 88 to 104 and 162 (continued)

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

The Chair: Today, we will continue to take action on draft resolutions submitted under cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”. I shall first give the floor to those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Macedo Soares (Brazil): I refer to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1, entitled “Follow-up to the high-level meeting held on 24 September 2010: revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”.

Although Brazil will not oppose the draft resolution, my delegation wishes to place on record its apprehension concerning the new wording of paragraph 4. In the original draft resolution (A/C.1/65/L.34), paragraph 4 reproduced the title of the high-level meeting held on 24 September, and that, by the way, is the wording of agenda item 162, which the General Assembly added to the agenda at its 30th plenary meeting, on 14 October.

The new version of paragraph 4 substantively modifies the thrust of the draft resolution. That paragraph opens, if not encourages, the possibility of direct action by the First Committee on the reform of

the Conference on Disarmament. No doubt the General Assembly has the legal means to do that. However, we should recall that the Conference on Disarmament was established as part of a diversified disarmament machinery by a special session of the General Assembly. During the high-level meeting, States addressed all of the issues regarding disarmament and the machinery devoted to it, not just the Conference on Disarmament.

The Brazilian delegation wishes to alert delegations to the wisdom of attempting to reform the Conference on Disarmament as an isolated measure, taken in an expedited manner.

Mr. Manfredi (Italy): In my explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35 I am also speaking on behalf of Bulgaria, Romania and Slovakia.

Bulgaria, Romania, Slovakia and my country, Italy, will vote, as previously, in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35, entitled “Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”, which will be introduced at this meeting by the representative of Indonesia.

Our decision is based on the conviction that the United Nations disarmament machinery urgently needs attention and political impetus geared to revitalizing it, in order to allow it to resume work on its main task: negotiating multilateral disarmament agreements. The decision by Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon to convene a high-level meeting in September to address the issue, and the ensuing summary document (A/65/496) — rich in suggestions and insights and

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.



containing, in paragraph 7, a reference to the proposal for convening a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD IV) — represent a first strong political signal in this direction.

In the opinion of our four countries, the convening of SSOD IV and the high-level meeting are, therefore, not contradictory. Rather, we consider them complementary, aimed at achieving the same goal. We are confident that the necessary resources will be identified within the United Nations budget to allow for their implementation.

Ms. Pappas (United States of America): The United States will support draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.47/Rev.1, entitled “Thirtieth anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research”, to underline our strong support for the work of the Institute, with which we have collaborated on several projects over the years, including giving recent support for its annual space security conference. The United States values the impartial, action-oriented research of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) and welcomes continuing projects on other key issues such as multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle, the disarmament machinery and understanding the fissile material cut-off treaty.

We would like to assure UNIDIR and its excellent Director of our continued and steadfast support. We would also like to note that, consistent with the relevant provisions of the Institute’s statute, the United States expects that regular budget funding will be limited, such that voluntary funding remains the principal source of funding for the Institute. We encourage Member States to provide such support to UNIDIR.

Mr. Ferami (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation’s position in not participating in the voting process on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

We have supported the reactivation of the Conference on Disarmament based on a balanced and comprehensive programme of work and on full observance of its rules of procedure. The Conference should be responsive to the priorities and security concerns of all Member States. However, we do not share the view that the document CD/1864 of 2009 presents a balanced and comprehensive programme of

work, though we joined the consensus in the Conference that year for the sake of showing flexibility.

We are of the firm conviction that the existence of nuclear weapons is the greatest threat to the security of all nations. Negotiation on nuclear disarmament therefore remains the highest priority of my delegation in the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. Tarar (Pakistan): We would like to support the point made by the Brazilian delegation regarding draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1.

Mr. Wang Qun (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1, concerning the follow-up to the high-level meeting on multilateral disarmament negotiations, China will join the consensus. At the same time, I would like to take this opportunity to state our principled position on the issue.

First, the purpose of the high-level meeting on 24 September was to strengthen the status of the Conference on Disarmament and to promote multilateral disarmament negotiations. Therefore, the follow-up action and relevant efforts should be carried out effectively to achieve those goals. During the process, the parties concerned should stress consensus, rather than making differences in ideas deeper and more acute. Working from the principle of maintaining the authoritative status of the Conference, and based on the rules of procedure, the relevant parties should respect one another and one another’s concerns by finding an appropriate solution to their differences and helping the Conference to make progress as quickly as possible.

Secondly, efforts should be made to achieve effective progress in advancing the Conference on Disarmament and other disarmament mechanisms. What is essential here is to include the common efforts of all members of the various mechanisms. Only in that way can we help to re-ignite the dynamism of the Conference and the other disarmament mechanisms in order to promote multilateral disarmament processes.

Thirdly, an early launch of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty in the Conference on Disarmament is very important. At the same time, substantive work should also be done in the areas of nuclear disarmament, the prevention of an arms race in outer space and guaranteeing the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

Fourthly, China believes that discussions on measures relating to the Conference on Disarmament and follow-up to the high-level meeting on the Conference should continue to abide by the principle of consensus. The problems of the Conference are the result of political factors and should be resolved through the consensus of all the parties.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of Indonesia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35.

Mr. Percaya (Indonesia): I have the privilege of speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

The heads of State and Government of NAM, at the fourteenth NAM Conference, held in Havana in September 2006, expressed their support for convening a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD IV). It was considered that SSOD IV would offer an opportunity to review, from a perspective more in tune with the current international situation, the most critical aspects of the disarmament process and to mobilize the international community and public opinion in favour of the elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, as well as of the control and reduction of conventional weapons.

It is important to recall that in the Millennium Declaration, adopted at the 2000 Millennium Summit, heads of States and Government also resolved to strive for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, and to keep all options for achieving that goal open, including the possibility of convening an international conference to identify ways to eliminate nuclear threats.

With such mandates, NAM believes it highly important to convene SSOD IV. We are deeply concerned about the failure to convene SSOD IV despite our efforts to make it possible, especially in the present momentum conducive to disarmament. Therefore, this year NAM is introducing a draft resolution, not a draft decision, on the issue.

We hope to increase attention to this vital matter by transforming it into the format of a resolution. This draft resolution will mandate the convening of the Open-ended Working Group to consider the objectives

and agenda, including the possible establishment of the preparatory committee for SSOD IV. It is our intention that that Open-ended Working Group should hold its organizational session at the earliest moment for the purpose of setting a date for its substantive sessions in 2011 and 2012, and submit a report on its work, including possible substantive recommendations, before the end of the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

While NAM notes that the previous meetings of the Open-ended Working Group did not produce an effective outcome on this issue, it hopes that the Group can function in the next two years through increased collective efforts and cooperation. The Open-ended Working Group for SSOD IV is extremely relevant, since the issue of nuclear disarmament is in the interests not only of NAM, but also the rest of the international community. Therefore, we expect that Member States will support the draft resolution.

Permit me now to speak in my national capacity to explain Indonesia's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1, on the follow-up to the high-level meeting held on 24 September 2010.

On that occasion our Foreign Minister joined other high-level representatives in thanking the Secretary-General for convening that important meeting. We believe that the gathering provided Member States the opportunity to mobilize political support for the agreed multilateral disarmament agenda. We recognize the reality that the United Nations disarmament machinery has failed to produce the results that we expect not because its rules of procedure are obsolete, but simply because there is a lack of political will.

By adopting the draft resolution, we expect that the revitalization of the Conference on Disarmament and other United Nations disarmament machinery can be ensured. Crucially, we must accelerate efforts to deliver on global nuclear disarmament commitments, for as long as even a single nuclear weapon exists, humankind is in danger of suffering a nuclear catastrophe by design or by accident.

Regarding the specific agendas that should be negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament, in the high-level meeting our Foreign Minister stated clearly that the Conference on Disarmament should advance negotiations towards a nuclear weapons convention, negative security assurances, the prevention of an arms

race in outer space and a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons, in accordance with the Shannon mandate. The Non-Aligned Movement also held a similar position.

It is clear to the Indonesian delegation that by the Conference on Disarmament taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations, the four agendas I have mentioned should all be considered in a balanced and comprehensive manner. In that respect, we lend our support to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1.

Mr. Toro (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela — reiterating its commitment to international peace and security, and convinced that respect for the norms and principles of international law enshrined in the United Nations Charter and other international legal instruments and that the promotion of the nuclear debate and non-proliferation are full guarantees of peaceful coexistence among nations — will support draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1, entitled “Follow-up to the high-level meeting held on 24 September 2010: revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”.

My country hopes that the Conference on Disarmament can emerge from the stagnation to which it has seen itself subjected for more than 15 years on the positions held with regard to substantive issues on its agenda. We are convinced of the need for the Conference to address priority matters as soon as possible, such as the negotiation of a treaty banning the production of fissile material, the prevention of an arms race in outer space, negative security assurances and nuclear disarmament.

We must continue contributing to strengthening multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. It is vital that the Conference on Disarmament, with the agreement of its member States, be able to fulfil its mandate as the multilateral negotiating forum par excellence of measures and agreements in that area.

However, we regret that the new version of the draft text contains, in paragraph 4, a substantial change in the title of the item, which has been included on the Committee's programme of work. For Venezuela, strengthening the Conference on Disarmament should be the priority. The desire to divert efforts in that area

would only weaken the international community's objectives of disarmament and non-proliferation.

My delegation echoes the concerns expressed by the delegation of Brazil on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1.

Mr. Çobanoğlu (Turkey): We would like to explain our position with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

As in previous years, the draft resolution includes a reference to the question of the expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament. As stated in the 2010 report of the Conference (A/65/27), to which this year's draft resolution pertains, the views of Member States on that issue are reflected in the verbatim records of the Conference.

In that respect, my delegation wishes to reiterate that the question of the expansion of the Conference membership is not a priority at this stage and should be addressed on a case-by-case basis, with due consideration of the contributions of candidates to international peace and security. For that reason, I would like to underline that the tenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1 should not be construed as a change in Turkey's well-known position on this question. Turkey joins the consensus on the draft resolution with that understanding.

Mr. Arrocha (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to address draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

Mexico is grateful to the Presidents of the Conference on Disarmament for submitting this draft resolution, the spirit of which we generally share. However, we requested a vote on paragraph 6, concerning the request that the Secretary-General ensure and strengthen, if necessary, the provision to the Conference on Disarmament of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services. We made that request because we believe that the lack of results in the Conference has demonstrated its ineffectiveness in reliably facing up to the responsibilities entrusted to it. For my country, it is unacceptable to continue to designate resources and efforts to pursue an exercise without direction until the

Conference on Disarmament shows substantive progress in its work.

Nevertheless, although we will abstain in the voting on this paragraph, Mexico will join in the adoption of the draft resolution.

The Chair: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.9. I give the floor the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.9, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission", was introduced by the representative of Benin at the 12th meeting, on 18 October 2010. The sponsors are listed in that document.

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.1/65/L.9 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.16. I give the floor the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.16, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned countries at the 21st meeting, on 28 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is indicated in the document.

With the permission of the Chairman, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.16. This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.16, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide all necessary support, within existing resources, to the regional centres in carrying out their programmes of activities.

The implementation of the request would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, "Disarmament", of the programme budget

for the biennium 2010-2011. The provision contained therein covers the three P-5 posts for directors of these regional centres for peace and disarmament, three P-3 posts for political affairs officers and four general service/local level posts for administrative assistants of the regional centres, and also includes general operating expenses of the three regional centres. The programmes of activities of the three regional centres would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources.

Accordingly, the adoption by the General Assembly of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.16 would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011 or under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. The attention of the Committee is also drawn to paragraph 67 of the first report of the Advisory Committee on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001, document A/54/7, which indicates that the use of the phrase "within existing resources" or similar language in resolutions has a negative impact on the implementation of activities. Therefore, efforts should be made to avoid the use of this phrase in resolutions and decisions.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.16 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.21. I give the floor the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.21, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean", was introduced by the representative of Peru, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are

members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, at the 16th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsor is indicated in document A/C.1/65/L.21.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.21 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1. I give the floor the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1 is entitled “Follow-up to the high-level meeting held on 24 September 2010: revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”. Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34 was introduced by the representative of Austria at the 12th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1 and CRP.3/Rev.5.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35. I give the floor the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35, entitled “Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement earlier in today’s meeting. The sponsor is indicated in document A/C.1/65/L.35.

With the permission of the Chairman, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35. This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

In paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide to convene an

Open-ended Working Group, working on the basis of consensus, to consider the objectives and agenda, including the possible establishment of the preparatory committee, for the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament; would also decide that the Open-ended Working Group shall hold its organizational session as soon as possible for the purpose of setting a date for its substantive sessions in 2011 and 2012, and submit a report on its work, including possible substantive recommendations, before the end of the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly; and would request the Secretary-General, from within available resources, to provide the Open-ended Working Group with the necessary assistance and services as may be required to discharge its tasks.

Pursuant to the request contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the Open-ended Working Group would hold in New York a one-day organizational session — that is, two meetings — in 2011; two sessions, five days per session, for a total of 20 meetings in 2011; and one session of five days for a total of 10 meetings in 2012.

The estimated resource requirements for the servicing of those sessions are as follows: first, \$258,300 for the servicing of 22 meetings to be held in 2011, including \$252,300 under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management”, and \$6,000 under section 28D, “Office of Central Support Services”, to provide interpretation services from and into the six official languages, a sound technician and technical support during those meetings; secondly, \$250,600 under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management”, for the translation of 13 documents, with a total 41,730 words, in the six official languages in 2011; thirdly, \$119,500 to service 10 meetings to be held in 2012, including \$114,500 under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management”, and \$5,000 under section 28D, “Office of Central Support Services”, to provide interpretation services from and into the six official languages, a sound technician and technical support during those meetings; and fourthly, \$135,700 under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management”, for the translation of six documents, with a total 22,700 words, in the six official languages in 2012.

It is determined that the total resource requirements of \$508,900 in 2011 to service the Open-ended Working Group could be absorbed from within the provisions to service the General Assembly on the understanding that the Open-ended Working Group cannot meet in parallel with the General Assembly and/or other working groups, the exact dates of its meetings will be determined in consultations between the substantive Secretariat and the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, and the documents of the Open-ended Working Group are submitted in time and within the estimated word count.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011. The additional financial implications in 2012, totalling \$255,200, will be considered in the context of the finalization of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

Attention is also drawn to the provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. The attention of the First Committee is also drawn to paragraph 67 of the first report of the Advisory Committee on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001 (A/54/7), in which the Committee noted that the use of the phrase "within existing resources" or similar language in resolutions had a negative impact on the implementation of activities. Therefore, efforts should be made to avoid the use of this phrase in resolutions and decisions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35. It will first take action on paragraph 3, on which a separate recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of),

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Paragraph 3 was retained by 164 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35 as a whole was adopted by 164 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.47/Rev.1. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Thirtieth anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research", was submitted by the representative of France. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.47/Rev.1 and CRP.3/Rev.5.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.47/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.55/Rev.1. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.55/Rev.1, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 21st meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.55/Rev.1 and CRP.3/Rev.5.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.55/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.56. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.56, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", was introduced by the representative of

Nepal at the 17th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.56 and CRP.3/Rev.5.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.56 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Brazil. The sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1. Separate recorded votes have been requested on paragraphs 2 and 6.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, 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, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Pakistan

Abstaining:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Paragraph 2 was retained by 165 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait,

Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, 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, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Austria, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway

Paragraph 6 was retained by 164 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1 as a whole. The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee decides to proceed accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.58. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.58, entitled "Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa", was introduced by the

representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo at the 17th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsor is indicated in document A/C.1/65/L.58 and CRP.3/Rev.5.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.58 was adopted.

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

Mr. Tarar (Pakistan): We have requested the floor to explain our position on two draft resolutions.

I refer first to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Follow-up to the high-level meeting held on 24 September 2010: revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations".

Our delegation shares the view that there is a need to revitalize the work of the Conference on Disarmament. At the same time, we also share the widely held position that the wider disarmament machinery and agenda also need to be reinvigorated.

In our view, the challenges facing the international disarmament agenda and machinery go beyond the Conference on Disarmament. The interlinked nature of international security and issues of disarmament requires that other disarmament forums, such as the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission, be simultaneously reinvigorated.

It is curious to note that the sponsors of the draft resolution have chosen to ignore the call made since 1994 by the 118-member Non-Aligned Movement to convene the fourth special session on disarmament. During the high-level meeting convened by the Secretary-General last month, the Non-Aligned Movement reiterated its call for the early commencement of the fourth special session. That was also duly noted by the Secretary-General in his Chair's summary (see A/65/496).

We are disappointed that the current draft text is focused merely on the Conference on Disarmament while ignoring the need to revitalize the entire disarmament machinery, including the need to convene the fourth special session of the General Assembly

devoted to disarmament (SSOD-IV). While my delegation has gone along with the draft resolution, we shall work to ensure that the First Committee takes into account the call by the majority of members of the Organization for the early convening of SSOD-IV as part of the process to advance multilateral disarmament negotiations and revitalize the global disarmament machinery.

I would now like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

Like other delegations, it was our strong preference to have that draft resolution adopted without a vote. It was in that spirit that our delegation made constructive proposals for a consensus text. However, one of the sponsors, in its misguided zeal, chose to ignore some of the important suggestions, including the deletion of a reference made to the programme of work of the Conference on Disarmament in document CD/1864.

It is well known that the Conference on Disarmament works on the basis of its rules of procedure, which provide for adoption of a programme of work before the commencement of its work every year. Selective reference to any particular programme of work of the Conference on Disarmament neither adds any value nor facilitates consensus. My delegation has therefore joined the consensus on the draft resolution as a whole but voted against its paragraph 2.

Mr. Wang Qun (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation just voted in favour and joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". We would like to take this opportunity to state China's relevant position on this issue.

China has always supported and actively participated in the work of the Conference on Disarmament. It is our hope that by formulating a comprehensive and balanced programme of work through consensus, the Conference will be well positioned for the early commencement of its substantive work, including on the fissile material cut-off treaty negotiations.

China supports the efforts of the international community to strengthen the Conference on Disarmament. Proposals to weaken the Conference through budget cuts are not welcome.

China joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1. We are not in favour of adopting the draft resolution by a vote. China believes that the draft resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament and its method of adoption should help the Conference to highlight consensus and break the stalemate, instead of further intensifying and deepening those differences. Dialogue on an equal footing is needed to adopt a draft resolution that reflects the concerns of all parties. That would benefit and be in the interest of all relevant parties.

China hopes that next year, all relevant parties will make concerted efforts to conduct dialogue on an equal footing and adopt the draft resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1, on the follow-up to the high-level meeting held on 24 September 2010, and draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1, on the report of the Conference on Disarmament, Cuba wishes to emphasize that greater efforts are needed to make progress in the multilateral negotiations on disarmament and to move towards the goal of a world without nuclear weapons.

As the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has stated on numerous occasions, those efforts must include, as a matter of the highest priority, the establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament within the Conference on Disarmament. They should also include the beginning of negotiations on a gradual programme for the total elimination of nuclear weapons within a defined time frame, including a convention on nuclear weapons.

It is unfortunate that the Conference on Disarmament, which the General Assembly has recognized as the sole multilateral forum for disarmament negotiations, remains unable to carry out any substantive work. But the solution does not lie in beginning to ignore the Conference or in minimizing its importance. On the contrary, now more than ever, it is our shared responsibility to preserve and strengthen the Conference.

We reiterate the call for flexibility, on the basis of respect for the rules of procedure, so that the Conference can adopt, as soon as possible, a broad and balanced programme of work that takes into account the real priorities in disarmament.

In that context, my delegation reiterates the special significance of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35, on convening the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, presented by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The Assembly should immediately prepare without delay the arrangements for that fourth special session, including by defining its objectives and agenda and by establishing a preparatory committee.

Ms. Skorpen (Norway): I am taking the floor on behalf of Austria, New Zealand and Norway to explain our vote on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

In the light of the efforts now under way to revitalize the multilateral disarmament machinery, we abstained in the voting on this paragraph. We sympathize fully with the intentions behind the call for a vote on it. We fully share the deep frustration over the more-than-decade-long stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament, and we do not consider the funding of that body to be an automatic issue. If the situation in the Conference on Disarmament does not change, we should revisit the issue of its financing, in both the First Committee and in the Fifth Committee.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Follow-up to the high-level meeting held on 24 September 2010: revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations".

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

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

disarmament. Therefore, in our view, the only eligible forum to possibly modify its mandate or rules of procedure is the Assembly's fourth special session on disarmament.

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

Mr. Rao (India): I have asked for the floor to explain India's position on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Follow-up to the high-level meeting held on 24 September 2010: revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations".

India has joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1. India's External Affairs Minister participated in the high-level meeting, where he welcomed this initiative of the Secretary-General. He said that the main purpose of the meeting was to send a clear message of support for the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum and to provide political impetus to the multilateral disarmament agenda.

While we share the widespread disappointment that we have been prevented from commencing negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament, we do not believe that the impasse stems from the disarmament machinery per se or from the existing rules of procedure. In fact, the participation at the ministerial level of a large number of countries was a demonstration of support for the role of the Conference as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum.

With a view to improving the text of the draft resolution, India suggested to the sponsors the inclusion of a reference to the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2), which was adopted by consensus. We are disappointed that the sponsors were not able to include that reference in the text. The current disarmament machinery owes its origin to that special session, and it would have been logical to both recall and reaffirm that fact.

Mr. Suda (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's position concerning the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35, entitled "Convening of the fourth

special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”.

My delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution. At the same time, however, Japan, as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1, on the follow-up to the high-level meeting held on 24 September 2010, welcomes the opportunity provided by the high-level meeting convened at the initiative of the Secretary-General and supports the inclusion in the provisional agenda of the Assembly's sixty-sixth session of the item entitled “Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”.

It is therefore the understanding of my delegation that draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35 should not prejudice future discussions on the follow-up to the high-level meeting or ongoing efforts to promote individual issues of disarmament.

Mr. Wilson (Australia): I take the floor to explain Australia's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35. Australia supported resolution 62/29 in 2007 and has supported draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35 this year.

In supporting draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35, Australia hopes that, in addition to any effort made to convene the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, there will be immediate and sustained effort on such tasks as implementing the consensus conclusions and recommendations of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; commencing negotiations on an fissile material cut-off treaty and commencing other substantive work in the Conference on Disarmament in 2011; bringing to an early conclusion United Nations-mandated negotiations on a comprehensive and effective treaty to establish an interim framework for the legitimate arms trade and to eradicate illicit trafficking in conventional arms; and reaching agreement on practical and practicable outcomes at the 2011 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Biological Weapons Convention.

I also take the floor to explain Australia's vote on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57/Rev.1. Australia is of the view that the Conference on Disarmament can and must return to work, including on fissile material cut-off treaty negotiations and substantive work on its other core issues. Nevertheless, Australia's deep concern about the state of the

Conference is a matter of record, including in the statement of Australia's Foreign Minister, Kevin Rudd, at the 24 September high-level meeting.

Mr. Danon (France) (*spoke in French*): I am speaking on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States on draft resolution A/65/C.1/L.35.

We abstained on the voting on paragraph 3. The draft resolution calls for the convening of an Open-ended Working Group in 2011, and that paragraph requests the Secretary-General to provide, within available resources, the Open-ended Working Group with the necessary assistance and services as may be required to discharge its tasks. No funding has been allocated to that Group in the framework of the 2010-2011 biennium. Therefore, we believe this will require the mobilization of additional budgetary resources, which could lead to additional budgetary tensions, given the already constrained climate.

We also abstained on the voting on the draft resolution as a whole, as we feel it prejudices the work commissioned by the Secretary-General in the outcome document of the high-level meeting on disarmament of 24 September 2010 (see A/65/496). In the outcome document, the Secretary-General tasked his advisory board with looking into possible options to revitalize the disarmament architecture. We believe that we should not pre-empt the process that was set up by the Secretary-General and that we should await the results of the advisory board consultations before considering next steps.

Mr. Jerman (Slovenia): I would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35, entitled “Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”. My delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution. Slovenia also voted in favour of the draft resolution on this topic three years ago, the last time it came up in the Committee.

It should be noted, however, that the reasoning behind our decision this year is a little bit different than it was in 2007. This year we witnessed the significant high-level meeting on revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations — the so-called high-level meeting convened by the Secretary-General one month ago here in New York. That is why we welcomed and sponsored a draft resolution aimed at following up the meeting.

In our view, the two emerging processes — the fourth special session on disarmament and the high-level meeting — should be complementary and inclusive and should pave the way to the same goal: revitalization of the international disarmament machinery. It is important to look further ahead and be more ambitious. We should not think only about revitalization of the disarmament machinery, but also about its comprehensive modernization and reform, notably of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. In that way we will make the whole process more transparent and flexible and consequently more efficient, thus revitalizing genuine international negotiations in the field of disarmament and arms control.

Linking both processes together will require not only strong political impetus, but also a spirit of inclusiveness and good faith. We believe that the authors of the draft resolution share our conviction. That is why Slovenia voted in favour of the draft resolution this time.

Mr. Hoffman (Germany): I have the honour to read out an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35 on behalf of Denmark, the Netherlands, Poland, Sweden and my own country, Germany.

As we did in 2007, we have once again voted in favour of the draft resolution entitled “Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”. Our decision to do so is based on the conviction that the United Nations disarmament machinery urgently needs political impulses towards its revitalization to allow it to resume its main task, that of negotiating multilateral instruments in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation.

As sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34/Rev.1, “Follow-up to the high-level meeting held on 24 September 2010: revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”, we warmly welcome the momentum created by the high-level meeting convened by Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon.

In our view there exists an intrinsic relationship between the considerations on the objectives of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD-IV) and the suggestions made by Member States and the Secretary-General at the

high-level meeting on revitalizing the multilateral disarmament machinery. In our understanding, follow-up measures to the high-level meeting will have to be taken into account by the Open-ended Working Group to be established in accordance with draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35.

In our view, SSOD-IV and the follow-up to the high-level meeting are not contradictory, but rather complementary efforts aimed at the same goal. We would like to stress, however, that SSOD-IV cannot be either an alternative to, or a reason to postpone, the work that needs to be done now, especially getting the Conference on Disarmament back to work and implementing the action plan on the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Finally, we would like to emphasize that we deem the financial resources referred to in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35 to be subject to regular budgetary procedures and to the scrutiny of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee, and that questions on the scope and financing of this Open-ended Working Group would need to be addressed and resolved in that context. Furthermore, with respect to the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs secretariat, we expect that no budget implications for the 2010-2011 budget will be brought forward in that context; in other words, that the Open-ended Working Group will be financed within existing resources. Should the Working Group convene only in 2012, the same applies to the budget negotiations for the biennium 2012-2013 or following.

Mr. Catalina (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): I am taking the floor to explain Spain's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.35. As we did in 2007, Spain voted in favour of the draft resolution on convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Spain would like to associate itself with the explanations of vote by the delegations of Germany, Slovenia and Italy on their own behalf as well as of other Member States. Also, to explain Spain's affirmative vote, I wish to stress two issues that the aforementioned delegations also emphasized.

First, Spain is fully convinced of the urgent need for the international community to strengthen its efforts to revitalize the disarmament machinery. In particular, it is imperative that the Conference on Disarmament

start to work as soon as possible on the task for which it was created: the negotiation of multilateral agreements on disarmament. Secondly, this conviction led us to lend all our weight to the Secretary-General's initiative to convene, on 24 September, a high-level meeting to revitalize the disarmament machinery.

Spain believes it is essential to follow up that initiative, taking into account the Secretary-General's suggestions. That is why Spain also fully supported the draft resolution on which we just voted. We are persuaded that an additional effort is needed to achieve the goal of revitalizing the disarmament machinery, an effort that fits into the Secretary-General's proposals or, in any event, is fully complementary to and compatible with them.

The Chair: We have thus concluded our consideration of drafts under cluster 7, in the first revision to informal paper 4. There has been a request to suspend the meeting for 10 minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 11.40 a.m. and resumed at 11.55 a.m.

The Chair: We shall now proceed to consider the draft resolutions under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons", contained in the first revision to informal paper 4. Before we take a decision on the draft resolutions under cluster 1, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to make general statements or introduce draft resolutions.

I give the floor to the representative of Mexico to introduce oral revisions to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.51.

Mr. Arrocha (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to introduce oral revisions to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.51, entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)". I will present four revisions, which I will read out in English, in succession.

The first revision is to the sixth preambular paragraph, in which we insert, after "as well as the Antarctic Treaty",

(*spoke in English*)

"and the declaration by Mongolia of its nuclear-weapon-free status".

(*spoke in Spanish*)

The second revision consists of an addition at the end of the ninth preambular paragraph, which addition reads:

(*spoke in English*)

"and commending the Organization for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean for its leadership in this endeavour,".

(*spoke in Spanish*)

Thirdly, we eliminate the tenth preambular paragraph.

Finally, our fourth revision replaces the existing paragraph 3 with the following text:

(*spoke in English*)

"Encourages States that have ratified the relevant protocols to the Treaty of Tlatelolco to review any reservation in this regard in accordance with Action 9 of the 2010 NPT Review Conference Final Document,".

(*spoke in Spanish*)

I would also like to announce that in addition to the sponsors listed in document A/C.1/65/L.51 and those mentioned by the Secretary, the Bahamas, Bolivia and Saint Lucia have become sponsors of this draft resolution. We reiterate that it is the intention of the sponsors that, as in previous years, the draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

The Chair: Before we take action on the draft resolutions under cluster 1, I wish to announce that the Secretariat has been informed that the amendments contained in documents A/C.1/65/L.59 and A/C.1/65/L.60 have been withdrawn.

I shall now give the floor to representatives wishing to make statements in explanation of vote or position before the voting.

Mr. Kleib (Indonesia): My delegation has requested the floor on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) to explain the position of the Movement on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1, entitled "Bilateral reductions of strategic nuclear arms and the new framework for strategic relations", introduced by the Russian Federation and the United States. Notwithstanding any previous engagement with

the sponsors, NAM's common position on the draft resolution is as follows.

NAM takes note of the signing of the New START treaty to achieve further deep cuts in the strategic nuclear weapons of the two countries and looks forward to its early ratification and entry into force. NAM stresses that reducing the deployment and operational status of nuclear weapons cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in and the total elimination of such weapons. The Movement calls on the United States and the Russian Federation to apply the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability to further reduce their nuclear arsenals, both warheads and delivery systems, under their Treaty obligations. NAM stresses that such cuts should be irreversible, verifiable and transparent, moving the States towards fulfilling their nuclear disarmament obligations and facilitating the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons.

The Movement emphasizes the ever-growing and most pressing need for concrete action by nuclear-weapon States to urgently take further substantive and practical measures, in accordance with their multilaterally agreed commitments to attain the goal of complete nuclear disarmament with a specified framework of time.

NAM remains deeply concerned about the strategic defence doctrines of nuclear-weapon States, including the NATO Strategic Concept, which not only set out rationales for the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons but also maintained the unjustifiable concept of international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and nuclear deterrence policies.

NAM recalls the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control. While noting some positive developments, the Movement emphasizes that much more remains to be done to attain a world free of nuclear weapons.

NAM expresses concern over the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and by their possible use or the threat of use. We urge States, particularly nuclear-weapon States, to accelerate efforts to fulfil their obligations on nuclear

disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation in all their aspects.

Finally, NAM reiterates that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The Movement emphasizes the need to start negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament as soon as possible on a basic programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, including a nuclear-weapon convention. The goal should be the complete elimination of nuclear weapons by 2025.

Pending the total elimination of such weapons, efforts should be pursued as a matter of urgent priority to conclude a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to all non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1.

My delegation fully subscribes to the explanation of vote on this draft resolution put on record by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Since the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the United States, the world has been under the dreadful shadow of nuclear weapons. The conclusion in 1968 of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) gave hope of getting rid of such inhuman weapons. In particular, its article VI stipulated that

“Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament”.

However, after more than 40 years, there are still thousands of nuclear warheads in the stockpiles of nuclear-weapon States.

The indefinite extension of the NPT was agreed in 1995 on the basis of a package of decisions, including the commitment by nuclear-weapon States to fulfill their obligations under article VI for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The reaffirmation, at the 2000 and 2010 NPT Review Conferences, of the unequivocal undertaking of nuclear-weapon States for

the total elimination of nuclear weapons was a clear manifestation of the international community's resolve for complete nuclear disarmament.

With regard to the legal aspect, in its 1996 advisory opinion the International Court of Justice unanimously concluded that:

“There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.”

The conclusion of the advisory opinion clearly stated that nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT have a legal obligation not only to pursue such negotiations but also to bring them to an early conclusion.

In saying that, my delegation believes that the draft resolution before us today is not a balanced text in terms of the obligations of nuclear-weapon States and the agreement reached by consensus at the NPT Review Conferences in 1995, 2000 and especially in 2010. The New START treaty does not apply the basic principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability. It is not aimed at nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of such weapons.

One of the parties to that Treaty has officially announced the allocation of more than \$100 billion for the modernization of nuclear warheads and the construction of new facilities for the development of nuclear weapons. According to the bilateral agreement, the parties only change the status of warheads from high-trigger alert to storage. It seems that the costs saved go to “modifying some components” and the development of more reliable, life-extended warheads, with a service life of 85 to 100 years or more. It is ironic to call that nuclear disarmament and talk about a world free from nuclear weapons.

The international community cannot turn a blind eye to these very clear and obvious facts that I have stated. The member States of the Non-Aligned Movement have already made their position very clear, through the Movement's explanation of vote, that “reducing the deployment” cannot substitute for the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Therefore, finally, given these reasons, my delegation will not take part in the Committee's voting process on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1 as a whole.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1.

A separate recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 7. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1, entitled “Bilateral reductions of strategic nuclear arms and the new framework for strategic relations”, was introduced by the representative of the United States of America, also on behalf of the Russian Federation, at the 11th meeting, on 15 October. The sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1. A separate recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 7.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Pakistan

Abstaining:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

[Paragraph 7 was retained by 163 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.]

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

The Chair: With regard to resolution A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1 as a whole, the sponsors have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee decides to proceed accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation", was submitted by the representative of France. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1 and CRP.3/Rev.5.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei

Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1 was adopted by 149 votes to 1, with 18 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.46/Rev.1. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.46/Rev.1, entitled “Preventing the acquisition by terrorists of radioactive sources”, was submitted by the representative of France. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.46 and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.5.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee decides to proceed accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.46/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.50. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.50, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*”, was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the 11th meeting, on 15 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.50 and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.5.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan,

Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Iceland, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Norway, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.50 was adopted by 121 votes to 27, with 22 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.51. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.51, entitled “Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)”, was introduced by the representative of Mexico. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.51 and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.5.

Mexico has just introduced oral revisions to the draft resolution.

The sixth preambular paragraph is revised by inserting, after “as well as the Antarctic Treaty”:

“and the declaration by Mongolia of its nuclear-weapon-free status”.

The ninth preambular paragraph is revised by inserting at the end:

“and commending the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean for its leadership in this endeavour.”.

The tenth preambular paragraph is deleted.

The existing paragraph 3 is replaced with the following text:

“Encourages States that have ratified the relevant Protocols to the Treaty of Tlatelolco to review any reservations in this regard, in accordance with action 9 of the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons;”.

I wish to announce that the Plurinational State of Bolivia, the Bahamas and Saint Lucia have also become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.51.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote, as orally revised. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.51, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of position after the decision has been taken.

Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As on previous occasions, Cuba abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”.

My country has expressed objections to the insufficiently transparent and selective manner in which the Code of Conduct was negotiated. It was drafted and adopted in a process outside the framework of the United Nations that did not include all interested

countries. Cuba believes that the issue of missiles in all its aspects can and should be considered within the United Nations and in an inclusive and transparent manner, without discrimination or selective criteria. All interested Member States have the legitimate right to participate openly in all stages of the consideration of the issue and in the adoption of related practical measures.

The Code of Conduct has significant deficiencies and limitations and does not adequately reflect the primary interests of a significant group of countries. The problems include the following examples.

The Code does not address the issue of the peaceful use of missile technology or the need for cooperation in that area to respond to the specific interests of developing countries.

The Code’s focus is limited to the horizontal aspect of proliferation and ignores vertical proliferation. We believe that a broad, balanced and non-discriminatory treatment of the issue of missiles requires us to go beyond horizontal proliferation to include other, equally important aspects of vertical proliferation, such as missile design, development, testing and deployment.

The Code fails to address the most serious problem: the existence and constant development of nuclear weapons, of which ballistic missiles are merely a delivery system.

The Code refers to ballistic missiles but not to other kinds of missiles, in spite of their importance. Issues relating to assistance and cooperation, which must inevitably be taken into account in addressing the question of missiles, are omitted in the Code.

This time, the draft resolution is even further from a consensus, as it includes specific selective references of Security Council resolutions.

Cuba is fully committed to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems, including ballistic missiles, in all their aspects. We are convinced that legally binding instruments negotiated multilaterally are the best and, in the long term, the only truly effective mechanisms to address disarmament and non-proliferation issues, including the proliferation of ballistic missiles.

Mr. Rao (India): I have asked for the floor to explain India’s vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1, A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1 and A/C.1/65/L.46/Rev.1.

India joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1, submitted by the Russian Federation and the United States, and voted in favour of its paragraph 7.

As the countries with the largest nuclear arsenals, the sponsors bear a special responsibility for nuclear disarmament. We appreciate the significance of the revitalization of the Russia-United States bilateral arms control process, and we welcome the new Russia-United States agreement to reduce their strategic nuclear arms. Between them, the two sponsors still hold more than 90 per cent of the nuclear weapons in the world, and the New START treaty is a step in the right direction. As we have repeatedly stressed, there is need for a step-by-step process underwritten by a universal commitment to and an agreed multilateral framework for achieving global and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament.

India voted in favour of paragraph 7. India's position has been consistent with regard to a fissile material cut-off treaty. Without prejudice to the highest priority that we attach to the goal of nuclear disarmament, India supports the negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament of a multilateral, non-discriminatory and internationally verifiable cut-off treaty that meets India's national security interests. India is a nuclear-weapon State and a responsible member of the world community, and would approach those negotiations as such.

India abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation". India is fully committed to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, including ballistic missiles. The proliferation of ballistic missiles in our region has adversely impacted India's security.

There is no legal regime governing the possession and use of missiles. The complexity of this issue arises mainly from the untenable claims made by some States for exclusive rights to the possession of advanced weapon systems and their continued modernization. Any initiative to address such concerns in a sustainable and comprehensive manner should be through an inclusive process.

We welcome the fact that the most recent Panel of Governmental Experts on the issue of missiles in all its aspects emphasized, in its report in document A/63/176, the important role of the United Nations in providing a

more structured and effective mechanism to build a consensus.

India abstained in the voting on the draft resolution, as it does not adequately recognize the need for a more inclusive approach, such as the one recommended in the Panel's report. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that several of the sponsors of this draft resolution had their experts on the Panel of Governmental Experts on the issue of missiles, which adopted its report by consensus.

My delegation went along with the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.46/Rev.1, entitled "Preventing the acquisition by terrorists of radioactive sources", which was adopted without a vote. Our support for the draft resolution is without prejudice to our position on the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management, to which India is not a party.

Mrs. Ancidey (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation asked for the floor to explain its position on draft resolutions A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1 and A/C.1/65/L.46/Rev.1.

The delegation of the Bolivarian Republic abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1 because it believes that The Hague Code of Conduct has a restrictive approach to the issue of missiles that generalizes the treatment of that topic without considering other elements of vital importance to developing countries, such as international cooperation on the research and development of new space technologies for peaceful purposes. Thus the Code does not distinguish between the technology of delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction and those related to activities for peaceful purposes.

Consequently, we are convinced of the need to make the efforts required to make it possible to continue to address this issue in the context of the United Nations, promoting a transparent, extensive and non-discriminatory debate with a view to generating the required consensus. In 2003, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela endorsed the initiative of The Hague Code on the understanding that it could be a formula conducive to broad agreements regarding exclusive control of the threat posed by the development of delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction. In our opinion, the lack of precision with which the Code has functioned on that

issue leads to the reservation of countries such as ours regarding its relevance.

Allow me now to address draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.46/Rev.1. The delegation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela joined the consensus on adopting this draft resolution, entitled “Preventing the acquisition by terrorists of radioactive sources”, in reaffirmation of our commitment to the objectives of disarmament and non-proliferation and our rejection of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, whatever its motivations.

Venezuela believes that international efforts to maintain the security and physical protection of radioactive sources are important. However, our delegation wishes to highlight that the best way to prevent terrorist groups from acquiring or accessing such material is through the complete elimination of weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, in accordance with the provisions of the relevant international legal instruments.

In that regard, States that possess weapons of mass destruction have the fundamental responsibility to adopt the necessary measures to put a definitive end to such weapons, which are the greatest threat to humankind’s existence. Strict adherence to commitments made pursuant to those instruments by States possessing weapons of mass destruction would significantly contribute to preventing terrorist groups from using those weapons to threaten international peace and security.

Mr. Suda (Japan): I would like to explain Japan’s position concerning draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.50, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*”. Japan abstained from voting on this draft resolution, but we appreciate Malaysia’s sincere efforts and commitment to the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament, as reflected in the draft resolution.

Japan also supports the unanimous opinion of the International Court of Justice on the obligations that exist under international law to pursue nuclear disarmament and conclude negotiations on this matter in good faith. For that, however, we must take further practical steps and effective measures towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons, with the involvement of the nuclear-weapon States. The approach towards the total elimination described in A/C.1/65/L.50 seems to be

different from this. That is the reason for Japan’s abstention on this draft resolution.

Mr. Wang Qun (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I am taking the floor to explain the Chinese delegation’s abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”.

China has always supported the principles and goals of this draft resolution and has consistently voted in favour of it in all previous sessions of the First Committee. This year, however, the draft resolution added a reference to pre-launch notifications. With respect to the role of pre-launch notifications, China has its own views and assessment. That is why China voted in abstention on this draft resolution.

Mr. Tarar (Pakistan): Our delegation requested the floor to explain our vote on two draft resolutions.

First is the draft resolution entitled, “Bilateral reductions of strategic nuclear arms and the new framework for strategic relations”, contained in document A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1.

We associate ourselves with the explanation of vote made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. We join other delegations in noting with interest the conclusion of negotiations on the New START treaty, which seeks reductions in the strategic nuclear arms of the Russian Federation and the United States. We consider this new bilateral treaty a step toward nuclear disarmament and hope that it will help generate momentum in the multilateral process toward nuclear disarmament. We also look forward to an early ratification of the treaty by both countries.

With regard to the reference to the early commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty, my delegation has explained its position in detail. Accordingly, we are not in a position to support the selective call for such negotiations, and thus our delegation voted against paragraph 7 of the draft resolution.

I would like to explain our vote on the draft resolution entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”, contained in document A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1. In the meetings held to discuss what was initially called the International Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation, Pakistan stressed that the missiles issue was complex. It was

therefore important to address it in a duly constituted multilateral forum so that the views and concerns of all countries could be taken on board.

While we acknowledge that some effort was made to accommodate the concerns of States, given the ad hoc nature of the forum where The Hague Code of Conduct was negotiated and lack of proper deliberations, the final product could not gain the support and acceptance of several missile-possessor States. As a country that was obliged to respond to the missile threat introduced into our region, it is our view that the Code does not address our security concerns. For these reasons, my delegation abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. Khazaee (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”.

My delegation believes that The Hague Code of Conduct basically suffers from procedural flaws. It was drafted and endorsed outside the United Nations in a selective, unbalanced and non-comprehensive manner, and therefore does not represent a multilaterally negotiated text. There is also a lack of transparency in the relationship between the Code and the non-transparent club of the Missile Technology Control Regime.

Furthermore, the Code has several substantive shortcomings, including the following.

First, the text contains no disarmament perspective and through that discrimination acknowledges possession of ballistic missiles by a few States while aiming to discourage others from obtaining them, irrespective of their reasons for so doing. Thus, The Hague Code of Conduct is discriminatory.

Second, The Hague Code of Conduct has focused exclusively on ballistic missiles and has failed to address other kind of missiles, particularly cruise missiles, which, coincidentally, have been used by the Code’s staunch supporters in recent years more than any other type of missiles.

Third, the Code has failed to provide a definition of ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, leaving that definition to the political considerations of a few possessor countries — members of an exclusive club — for arbitrary interpretation.

Fourth, the text does not offer a distinction between space-launch vehicle programmes and ballistic missile programmes. Thus, the space-launch vehicle programmes are also subject to arbitrary, unilateral interpretation.

Fifth, the language of the Code of Conduct is vague and restrictive with regard to assistance and cooperation in the area of space-launch vehicles.

Sixth, the important issue of the development of ballistic missiles by current possessors has not been addressed in comparison with the proliferation aspect. In fact, the Code is silent on the vertical proliferation of both ballistic and cruise missiles.

Seventh — last but not least — the right of all States to the peaceful application of the benefits of space, including access to the technology necessary for space-launch vehicles, has been overlooked or neglected.

Regrettably, the approach that governed the discussion on the draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1 may be construed as a continuation of the sponsors’ intention, based on a take it or leave it approach.

There was a promise by the Chair of the 2005 conference to have substantive and positive consideration of the amendments presented by the non-subscribing States. Nevertheless, we have not noticed any substantive changes in the draft resolution compared to previous versions. Even worse, a reference has been added to Security Council resolution 1887 (2009) to the text. The Non-Aligned Movement has strong reservations with regard to that resolution. My delegation was therefore once again obliged to vote against this draft resolution.

Mr. Deyneko (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation would like to make a statement on its reasons for voting on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”.

Our delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1. In so doing, we did our utmost to ensure that the draft reflected the actual situation, and we focused on the collective search for solutions in the priority tasks facing the Code.

Among other things, it was proposed that the sixth preambular paragraph be brought into line with Security Council resolution 1540 (2004), in the note referring to

ballistic missiles as delivery systems for nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. Concerning the operative section, we wanted paragraphs 3 and 4 to be merged and to start with:

“Encourages States that have already subscribed to the Code of Conduct to make every effort to increase the efficiency of the Code”,

and the text of the rest of paragraph 4 would remain the same. In our view, this wording would allow us to avoid an excessively high evaluation of the activities of the Code of Conduct, placing the focus on the efforts that need to be made, by its participants first and foremost.

Russia is keen to see the Code become a truly effective universal mechanism of transparency and trust in missile and outer space activities and, going forward, an international forum for tackling global missile non-proliferation matters. We trust that the Russian approach will be duly taken into account during the work of the Code itself.

Mr. Rachmianto (Indonesia): I requested the floor to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”.

While we share the objective of this draft resolution — to increase regional stability and global security, inter alia by addressing the ongoing proliferation of ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction — this noble aim by itself does not, in our view, suffice or lead to ensuring increased security for all countries. The best way to establish broad international norms in this area will be through negotiating a legally binding instrument that prohibits the proliferation of ballistic missiles and reaches out to all States concerned.

A treaty-based regime would also verify the seriousness of key countries in implementing the requirements of the Code of Conduct and the necessary fulfilment of declarations on their missile policy and plans, including on pre-launch notifications. The development of such an instrument should be inclusive and involve all countries concerned. Indonesia has

consistently believed that this would be the best approach, which is why we sponsored other, similar draft resolutions, which reflect the necessity of, first and foremost, drawing the attention of the United Nations system to the need to tackle the issue of missiles in all its aspects and advancing efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space.

We hope that the Code of Conduct will some day be transformed into an inclusive venue, open to the idea of developing a treaty-based regime. It is very important that such a regime also contain provisions on international cooperation and assistance in the area of rocketry for peaceful uses. Concrete work in this direction will give clear incentives to the vast majority of developing countries to join efforts in this area.

It is critical that, when considering draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45, we are also mindful for the nature of threats posed by the proliferation and the continued development and advances in new types of ballistic missiles by some countries. We therefore decided to abstain from the voting on this draft resolution.

Ms. Skorpen (Norway): I am taking the floor to explain why Norway is not in a position to support draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.50, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*”.

While Norway supports the general objective of the draft resolution, and while we also see some improvement in the language over previous years, we do not find the general approach and methodology conducive to further nuclear disarmament. In particular, my delegation is far from convinced that the Conference on Disarmament provides the best arena for developing legally binding disarmament commitments. We also have serious reservations concerning the reference to the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention in the fifteenth preambular paragraph. It is highly doubtful, in our view, that the allusion to such a specific treaty text at this point in time is an adequate way to catalyse the process towards the abolition of nuclear weapons.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.