



General Assembly

Sixty-third session

First Committee

21st meeting

Thursday, 30 October 2008, 3.25 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chairperson: Mr. Marco Antonio Suazo (Honduras)

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

Agenda items 81 to 96 (*continued*)

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

The Chairperson: This afternoon, the Committee will take action on the remaining draft resolutions under cluster 6 listed in informal paper 2.

I call on the representative of Morocco.

Mr. Marrakchi (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): I thank you, Mr. Chairperson, for allowing my delegation to take the floor on an exceptional basis regarding an important issue that is of concern to the Committee, although not formally part of its agenda.

Today, 30 October 2008, is the second anniversary of the adoption of the Rabat Statement of Principles, which marked the entry into force of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism. The co-Chairs and the 73 partner nations of the Global Initiative drafted a joint statement commemorating that event before adopting it and requesting the Kingdom of Morocco to read out its text.

Unfortunately, owing to time constraints, I cannot read out the list of partners, as I should have liked to do. However, annex II to the joint statement contains the complete list, and annex I reproduces the text of the Rabat Statement of Principles.

(*spoke in English*)

“This joint statement is made on behalf of the co-Chairs and the 73 partner nations of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, launched by the United States and the Russian Federation on 15 July 2006.

“Since the adoption of its Statement of Principles on 30 October 2006 in Rabat, Morocco, the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism has demonstrated its relevance in addressing the risks of a catastrophic terrorist attack and helping to remedy the actual gaps in the international non-proliferation regime, through building and improving capacities to prevent the acquisition, transport or use by terrorists of nuclear materials and radioactive substances or improvised explosive devices using such materials, as well as hostile actions against nuclear facilities.

“Partner nations stress the relevance of the Global Initiative in this context and draw the attention of the international community to the responsibility every State has to each of its citizens to identify clearly the concrete steps which can be taken, respectively and together, to prevent nuclear terrorism and ensure peace and security.

“Building on the results of the four meetings of partner nations, held in Morocco, Turkey, Kazakhstan and Spain, the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism has managed to deepen and broaden participation

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 C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.



across the partnership. Today, the 75 partner nations renew their commitment to develop capacity to combat nuclear terrorism according to the following principles: developing, if necessary, and improving accounting, control and physical protection systems for nuclear and other radioactive materials and substances; enhancing security of civilian nuclear facilities; improving the ability to detect nuclear and other radioactive materials and substances in order to prevent illicit trafficking in such materials and substances, to include cooperation in the research and development of national detection capabilities that would be interoperable; improving capabilities of participants to search for, confiscate and establish safe control over unlawfully held nuclear or other radioactive materials and substances or devices using them; preventing the provision of safe haven to terrorists and financial or economic resources to terrorists seeking to acquire or use nuclear and other radioactive materials and substances; ensuring adequate respective national legal and regulatory frameworks sufficient to provide for the implementation of appropriate criminal and, if applicable, civil liability for terrorists and those who facilitate acts of nuclear terrorism; improving capabilities of participants for response, mitigation and investigation in cases of terrorist attacks involving the use of nuclear and other radioactive materials and substances, including the development of technical means to identify nuclear and other radioactive materials and substances that are, or may be, involved in the incident; and promoting information-sharing pertaining to the suppression of acts of nuclear terrorism and their facilitation, taking appropriate measures consistent with their national law and international obligations to protect the confidentiality of any information which they exchange in confidence.

“The abovementioned principles constitute the core of the commitment of partner nations to address the threat of nuclear terrorism to international peace and security on a voluntary yet determined and systematic basis, consistent with national legal authorities and obligations they have under relevant international legal frameworks, notably the Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, the

Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and its 2005 amendment, United Nations Security Council resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1540 (2004).

“Partner nations recognize the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in the fields of nuclear safety and security and commend the Agency for its action in this field. Partner nations intend for the IAEA to contribute to the Initiative through its ongoing activities and technical expertise.

“Furthermore, partner nations recognize the need for greater cooperation between the counter-terrorism and counter-proliferation communities and stress their interest in strengthening the Global Initiative Exercise Program.

“While acknowledging the significant progress of the Global Initiative since it was launched two years ago, partner nations stress that much more work remains to be done. Therefore, partner nations give the utmost importance to continuing outreach efforts to further expand participation. While standing upon the principles at the heart of this initiative and reiterating their commitment to realize the objective of making it a truly global effort, partner nations recall that the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism remains open to new partners and call upon interested nations which share the common goals of the initiative and are committed to combating nuclear terrorism to endorse the Statement of Principles, thus joining their effort to defeat the serious threat to the international peace and security originating from a potential attack involving nuclear or radiological materials.”

Mr. Çobanoğlu (Turkey): My intervention pertains to the statement that has just been delivered by the representative of Morocco on the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism.

In line with its firm stance against terrorism, Turkey has from the outset supported the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, which was launched by President Bush of the United States and President Putin of the Russian Federation. As noted in the statement delivered on behalf of the partner nations, we hosted the second meeting of the Initiative, in Ankara. We believe that the success of the Initiative

depends, among other things, upon the existence of a clearly defined consensus-based decision-making procedure, which, as we noted, was agreed at the first meeting, in Rabat. That was particularly important in the context of the participation of new partners in the Initiative.

Unfortunately, in the course of events, that agreement was breached, inevitably affecting Turkey's approach to the Initiative. Nevertheless, the aims of the Initiative remain highly relevant for Turkey. I should like to place on record that it was with that understanding that Turkey supported the joint statement made on behalf of the partner nations of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism.

The Chairperson: We shall now proceed to complete the work we began yesterday on informal paper 2. Yesterday, we stopped without taking up the draft resolutions and decisions under cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

We shall first take action on draft decision A/C.1/63/L.33. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/63/L.33, entitled "Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament", was introduced by the representative of India at the 15th meeting, on 22 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.33 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.7.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/63/L.33 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.36. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate recorded vote has been requested on words in the tenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.36, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 15th meeting, on 22 October 2008. The sponsors of the

draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.36 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3** and A/C.1/63/CRP.3**/Add.3, Add.4, Add.5* and Add.6.

A separate recorded vote has been requested on the words "and Third" in the tenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.36. The Committee will now take a separate vote on the words "and Third" in the tenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.36.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, 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, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain

and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Côte d'Ivoire, Iran (Islamic Republic of)

The words "and Third" were retained by 159 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Côte d'Ivoire advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.36 as a whole. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.36, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures", as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania,

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

Against:

None

Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.36 was adopted by 164 votes to none.

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

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.52. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.52, entitled "United Nations study on disarmament and non-proliferation education", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 15th meeting, on 22 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.52 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.2, Add.3, Add.4, Add.6 and Add.7. In addition, Iraq has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.52 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.53. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.53, entitled “United Nations Disarmament Information Programme”, was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 15th meeting, on 22 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.53 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.2, Add.3, and Add.4.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.53 was adopted.

The Chairperson: I call on the representative of India.

Mr. Rao (India): I speak in regard to draft decision A/C.1/63/L.33, entitled “Role of Science and Technology in the context of international security and disarmament”, which has just been unanimously adopted by the Committee. I would like to say that, as we informed the Secretariat earlier, the draft decision was not open for additional co-sponsorship, so we ask that the record be accordingly corrected.

The Chairperson: I now call on representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions or decision just adopted.

Mr. Tarar (Pakistan): We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.36, but we would like to underline that the reference to ammunition in the third preambular paragraph goes beyond the scope of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. Our focus should be on strengthening existing mechanisms rather than on creating new ones.

Mr. Bolourian (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would just like to underline that the same explanation that my delegation provided with regard to paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.57 applies to certain words of the tenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.36, by which the General Assembly would welcome the reports of the Biennial Meetings of States to Consider the Implementation of

the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

The Chairperson: We have thus concluded our consideration of the draft resolutions and decision under cluster 6, as listed in informal paper 2.

We shall now turn to the draft resolutions listed in informal paper 3. Once again, we will begin with those under cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”. I call on the representative of Pakistan to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.7*.

Mr. Tarar (Pakistan): I have the honour to take the floor to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.7*, entitled “Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons”, on behalf of the delegations of Bangladesh, Benin, Brunei Darussalam, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Myanmar, Peru, the Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam and my own delegation.

Raised by non-nuclear-weapon States in the 1960s, the demand for security assurances crystallized in 1968 during the final phase of the negotiations on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). However, the response of nuclear-weapon States, reflected in Security Council resolution 255 (1968), was not adequate. At the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, it was agreed to conclude an international instrument to provide binding and credible negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States. Unfortunately, however, the declarations made by four of the five nuclear-weapon States at that session, and later at the NPT Review and Extension Conference, and reflected in Security Council resolution 984 (1995), were also considered insufficient, qualified and partial by most non-nuclear-weapon States.

Several factors have militated against the fulfilment of the expectation that the end of the cold war would make it easier for nuclear-weapon States to extend nuclear security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States. The central question is: Why should negative security assurances be given, and that too in

the form of a legal instrument? Allow me to mention a few of the potent justifications in that regard.

First, the principle of the non-use of force or threat thereof, enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, extends to nuclear weapons. In that context, the right to self-defence is not unfettered. International humanitarian law requires proportionality of response in armed conflicts, both conventional and strategic.

Secondly, the positive and negative assurances given thus far, being conditional and non-binding, essentially amount to political declarations. Moreover, most such assurances would become inoperative in case of an attack on the States providing the assurances or their allies mounted by a nuclear-weapon State or in alliance with it. Even States of a nuclear-weapon-free zone are subject to the same provisos and do not have any ironclad guarantees. Only one nuclear-weapon State has given unconditional negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon and nuclear-weapon-free-zone States.

The indefinite extension of the NPT has created the presumption among nuclear-weapon States that they have the right to retain nuclear weapons while complete nuclear disarmament under article VI of the NPT remains open-ended and negotiable. Negative security assurances are unfinished business that has to be accomplished sooner or later, since the NPT Review Conference and the September 2005 Summit did not address the issues of disarmament, non-proliferation and negative security assurances.

New security doctrines envisaging the possible use of nuclear weapons against the use or threat of use of chemical and biological weapons and against terrorism run counter to the letter and spirit of Security Council resolutions 255 (1968) and 984 (1995). In addition, new security doctrines that conjure up scenarios of winnable nuclear wars against non-nuclear-weapon States are not tenable.

The Non-Aligned Movement has rightly expressed concern over the development of new types of nuclear weapons and their possible deployment. New doctrines advocating the development of tactical nuclear weapons for actual use, while eroding the confidence-building effect of negative security assurances, embody a disastrous miscalculation that the use of low-yield nuclear weapons would remain localized and not conflagrate beyond the theatre of conflict.

The expansion of nuclear alliances and provisions for the sharing of nuclear weapons and command and control among alliance members has increased the geographical scope of the use of nuclear weapons. For example, NATO retains the option to use nuclear weapons as part of its deterrence posture. That is inconsistent with the pledges of negative security assurances of its nuclear-weapon-States members.

The concept of negative security assurances is weakened by the professed right to use overwhelming force, understood to include nuclear weapons and a nuclear response to non-nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

Such factors lend great urgency to the task of concluding credible negative security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States. The sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.7* seek to underline that sense of urgency and to see it translated into concrete action.

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

The sponsors believe that the conclusion of effective arrangements on negative security assurances could constitute a major confidence-building measure in the current tense international circumstances between nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States, as well as among nuclear-weapon States. It could also contribute to reducing nuclear danger. It could ease the threats that arise from new doctrines of nuclear use and facilitate negotiations on other matters relating to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Accordingly, my delegation and the sponsors urge the adoption of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.7* by the widest possible majority.

The Chairperson: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.7*. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.7*, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the present meeting, the 21st. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.7* and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.3 and Add.6. In addition, Iraq has become a sponsor.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.7 was adopted by 110 votes to 1, with 55 abstentions.*

The Chairperson: I now call on the representative of South Africa, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Kellerman (South Africa): I thank you, Mr. Chairperson, for the opportunity to explain my delegation's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.7*, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", which the Committee has just adopted.

At the outset, I wish to place on record that the issue of security assurances continues to be of great importance to South Africa. My delegation has often stated that genuine security cannot be achieved merely by ensuring that the non-nuclear-weapon States abandon the nuclear-weapons option, and pointed out that what is also required is for such States not to feel threatened by nuclear weapons. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, South Africa therefore shares the view that efforts aimed at the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States should be pursued as a matter of priority.

It is, however, South Africa's belief that security assurances rightfully belong to those States that have forsworn the nuclear-weapons option, as opposed to those that still prefer to keep their options open.

Because the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is the primary nuclear non-proliferation agreement under the terms of which the non-nuclear-weapon States have forgone the nuclear-weapons option, it logically follows that security assurances should be provided under the NPT. Unfortunately, that is not reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.7*.

In South Africa's view, the negotiation of legally binding security assurances should take place under the NPT umbrella and within the context of the strengthened review process of the Treaty. The negotiation of negative security assurances within the NPT context — as opposed to the suggestions contained in draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.7* — would, in our view, provide a significant benefit to the NPT States parties and could serve as an incentive to those that remain outside the Treaty.

As South Africa continues to hold the view that security assurances should be provided in the context of an internationally legally binding instrument — which could be in the format either of a separate agreement reached in the context of the NPT or of a protocol to the Treaty — my delegation therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.7*.

The Chairperson: The Committee has thus taken action on all draft resolutions in this cluster.

I should like to inform members that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56, in cluster 4, have requested that action on it be postponed until tomorrow.

I now invite members to move on to cluster 6, “Other disarmament measures and international security”. I call on those members wishing to make general statements on this cluster.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to make a general statement on cluster 6, “Other disarmament measures and international security”, under which draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.45, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”, has been submitted.

Cuba fully shares the concern expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.45 regarding the use of information technologies and means for purposes inconsistent with international stability and security. In

addition, the draft resolution appropriately emphasizes the need to prevent the use of information resources and technologies for criminal or terrorist purposes.

In that context, my delegation is obliged to denounce the radio and television aggression that the Government of the United States of America has carried out against Cuba for several decades. That aggression openly violates the principles of international law and the standards and regulations of the International Telecommunications Union.

The United States Government is not concerned about the damage that could be caused to international peace and security by creating such dangerous situations as the use of a military plane to transmit television signals towards Cuba without our consent. Over the past two years, the radio broadcasts transmitted towards Cuba from the United States through various services and on various frequencies have exceeded 2,300 hours per week. Several of those radio broadcasts are associated with or provide their services to organizations linked to known terrorist elements that reside in and carry out acts against Cuba from United States territory, and broadcast programmes that incite sabotage, political attacks, assassinations and other commonplace activities of radio terrorism.

The World Radiocommunication Conference, held last year in Geneva, spoke out against the illegality of the transmissions against Cuba from an aircraft, describing them as contrary to the Radiocommunication Regulations. Our country will continue to do everything in its power to repel these unacceptable and illegal aggressive actions.

Because we believe that draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.45 addresses a very important issue, Cuba decided to co-sponsor it once again this year. We hope that, as at previous sessions, it will receive the support of the vast majority of delegations.

Mr. Kim Bonghyun (Republic of Korea): I have the honour to make a general statement on a new biennial draft resolution under cluster 6, entitled “Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities” and contained in document A/C.1/63/L.43*, on behalf of 61 sponsors, including Australia, the co-author of the draft resolution. In order to save time, my delegation will not read out the list of sponsors.

The Republic of Korea and Australia submitted this draft resolution based on the view that the

proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the illicit transfer of conventional weapons can be addressed more effectively by focusing on illicit brokering activities. We hope to raise awareness of the threat to international and security posed by illicit brokering activities and to contribute to the international effort to address them.

The draft resolution calls upon all Member States to establish appropriate national laws and/or measures to prevent and combat illicit brokering activities. It also reaffirms that such activities should not hamper the legitimate arms trade and international cooperation with respect to materials, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes, and underlines the right of Member States to determine the specific scope and content of the domestic measures that they take.

The two authors engaged in an extensive consultation process at both multilateral and bilateral levels during this session of the First Committee. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all delegations for their valuable contributions to the draft resolution and for the speed of cooperation among Member States.

My delegation sincerely hopes that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

The Chairperson: I shall now give the floor to representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Litavrin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We have certain reservations on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.43, entitled “Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities”. We have spoken about this on earlier occasions. We have no fundamental objection to combating illicit brokering materials related to weapons of mass destruction and in conventional weapons, particularly in small arms and light weapons, but we believe that it is methodologically flawed to mix those two concepts. We would have preferred two draft resolutions on this issue that we could support. At the same time, recognizing the importance of the issue, we did not wish to speak against it and for that reason will not take part in the decision on this draft resolution.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1, entitled

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

As is known, despite the fact that resolutions on this issue have been adopted by consensus since 1985, in 2005 that consensus was broken for the first time when action was taken on resolution 60/55. Cuba, which was one of the countries that abstained in the voting on resolution 60/55 three years ago, at the time called it a backward step with respect to resolutions that we had adopted on that issue for many years. Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1, instead of seeking to regain lost ground and bringing us closer to consensus, moves us even further away from it.

In our opinion, the main weaknesses of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1 are as follows. First, it is selective, unbalanced and politicized. The text is significantly removed from the spirit of cooperation of its predecessor resolutions.

Second, the conventionally agreed wording on arms limitation, disarmament and non-proliferation has been altered with the clear intention of highlighting non-proliferation over disarmament.

Third, as happened in 2005 with resolution 60/55, in the use of the phrase “States parties” has been reduced in the draft resolution to the point that it has been completely removed from the operative part of the text.

Fourth, the part of the text that appeared until 2005, referring to the need to resolve compliance concerns by means of implementation consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, relevant treaties and other sources of international law, has yet to be restored. In that regard, we believe that subjective and unilateral assessments of non-compliance and the intent to use those assessments for political purposes will only undermine international and multilateral efforts to strengthen an effective global disarmament and non-proliferation regime.

Fifth, in addressing the issue of verification, the draft resolution ignores the role of the mechanisms and procedures stipulated in the aforementioned international agreements. It is regrettable that the wording on the need to guarantee verification measures on compliance with disarmament agreements has been eliminated.

Sixth, the wording on the role of the United Nations in restoring the integrity of non-proliferation,

arms control and disarmament agreements and in promoting negotiations on those agreements has again been eliminated.

Seventh, the draft resolution disregards the basic principle of the indivisibility of compliance, which was referenced in the text until resolution 57/86. On the basis of that principle, we urge all States parties to arms limitation and disarmament and non-proliferation agreements to implement and comply with the entirety of all provisions of such agreements. However, draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1 once again opens the way for unacceptable interpretations of rights under those treaties whereby it could be admissible for some parties to fail to implement certain obligations under those treaties.

The eighth weakness is that paragraph 5 of the draft resolution presupposes non-compliance by States and urges them to make the strategic decision to come back into compliance with their obligations, despite the fact that the principles of law prescribe a legal sequence of events. As a result, a call for a State not in compliance to come back into compliance must always be preceded by a declaration of non-compliance, pursuant to the relevant provisions of each treaty.

Our ninth objection is that the draft resolution does not reflect the fact that each agreement and treaty has its own specific characteristics, modalities and mechanisms to determine which circumstances can be interpreted as non-compliance. Therefore, we believe it counterproductive to approach all cases from a single point of view.

Cuba has always defended the need to preserve and strengthen multilateralism and to guarantee the strict observance of all disarmament and non-proliferation agreements. However, we believe that draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1 does not adequately address that issue. For these reasons, Cuba is unable to support the draft resolution and will abstain in the voting.

Mr. Danon (France) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.45, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and

Montenegro; as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia align themselves with this declaration.

The European Union will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.45. At the same time, we wish to highlight the relationship between security and telecommunications technologies. That relationship must be seen in a broad understanding of security in a world where technologies are constantly evolving. The European Union supports the basic principle of the draft resolution. The dissemination and use of information technologies and means affect the interests of the entire international community, and broad international cooperation is necessary to achieve optimal effectiveness.

The European Union is concerned that such technologies and means can potentially be used for purposes inconsistent with the objectives of maintaining international stability and security, and may, on the contrary, adversely affect the integrity of the infrastructure of States to the detriment of their security in both the civil and military fields. The threat to cybersecurity can originate from attacks coordinated by organized criminals, non-State actors, including extremists and terrorists, and individual politically motivated hackers, as the massive number of denial-of-service cyberattacks on a number of States Members of the United Nations demonstrates.

In this regard, the European welcomes Security Council resolution 1822 (2008), which expresses, inter alia, deep concern about criminal misuse of the Internet by terrorist groups. The European Union also welcomes initiatives of regional and global organizations to enhance cybersecurity, notably the launch of the Global Cybersecurity Agenda by the International Telecommunication Union, as well as the establishment of a high-level group of experts to further develop the Global Cybersecurity Agenda and the issuance of the group's recent report.

One effective way to fight criminal or illegal use of information technologies is for States to criminalize the misuse of information technology and to implement measures to prevent damage to critical information infrastructures, regardless of the source of the threat. In this regard, the European Union draws attention to the Council of Europe's Convention on Cybercrime, which is open for accession to non-members of the Council, and we call upon all States to accede to it.

The European Union invites the group of governmental experts to be established in 2009 to analyse, among other mandated activities, instances in which critical national information infrastructures have come under attack and to consider recommendations on how to investigate and criminalize such acts, including ways to facilitate tracking attacks on critical information distribution infrastructures, and, when appropriate, the disclosure of tracking information to other States. The group may also address such issues as strengthening of cybersecurity infrastructure, legal cooperation among Governments, exchanging information about threats and attacks, countering cyberthreats and raising awareness among Governments, businesses and the general public.

Mr. Bolourian (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments".

Based on its principled position, my delegation is of the strong belief that all States parties must comply on a non-discriminatory basis with all provisions of the treaties to which they are party. At the same time, we are of the belief that subjective and unilateral assessments of non-compliance, as well as attempts to use such assessments as political and foreign policy leverage, would only undermine international and multilateral efforts to strengthen an effective global disarmament and non-proliferation regime.

On the other hand, we believe that the international disarmament and non-proliferation instruments include both rights and obligations for States parties. In this way, the restriction or denial of the inalienable rights of States parties enshrined in these treaties, such as the peaceful use of nuclear energy, constitute clear non-compliance with the provisions of the said treaties.

Addressing the content of the text on its merits, we are satisfied to see that, in draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1, the concept of "other agreed obligations" (para. 1), which clearly includes the obligations agreed within disarmament treaty review conferences, such as the Review Conferences on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), continues to remain in the draft. That reference underscores the fact that compliance with these

obligations are as fundamental and essential as the obligations enshrined in the legal instrument themselves.

Moreover, referring to the concept of compliance as a contribution to efforts aimed at preventing the development of weapons of mass destruction, another element of the present draft urges those States not currently in compliance with their respective obligations under article VI of the NPT to come back into compliance. The continued failure of some nuclear-weapon States to comply with their obligations under the 1995 and 2000 NPT Review Conferences would undermine the viability and effectiveness of and confidence in the Treaty.

However, in our view, the draft resolution continues to suffer from basic substantive shortcomings, as follows.

First, while nuclear disarmament is the highest priority for the international community, the text fails to accord priority to nuclear disarmament obligations and commitments, and compliance with those obligations.

Secondly, the central role of the international organizations responsible for the verification of compliance by States parties with the disarmament and non-proliferation instruments, in accordance with the procedures defined in those instruments, is overlooked.

Thirdly, consultations and cooperation among States parties to the relevant instruments in resolving their concerns with regard to cases of non-compliance as well as implementation, in accordance with the procedures defined in those instruments, are essential to multilateralism. That fundamental principle has been totally ignored.

Fourthly, compliance is a very important legal issue. Therefore, precision and clarity are needed in any text dealing with this sensitive issue. The content of the draft lacks such a quality.

Last but not least, we cannot agree to an approach that supports national technical means for verification, compliance and enforcement. Such an approach, which tends to be implemented on the basis of politically motivated assumptions, would lead to the resort to unilateralism and undermine the multilaterally agreed verification mechanisms.

For these reasons, my delegation has opted to abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

The Chairperson: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the vote.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 6. We shall first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”, was introduced by the representative of the United States of America at the 10th meeting, on 16 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1, A/C.1/63/CRP.3 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.1*, Add.2, Add.3*, Add.4 and Add.7.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South

Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Bahrain, Belarus, Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1 was adopted by 142 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

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

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.43*. I give the floor the Secretary.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.43*, entitled “Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities”, was introduced by the representative of the Republic of Korea at the 15th meeting, on 22 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.43* and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.1*, Add.3*, Add.4, Add.5*, Add.6 and Add.7.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.43 was adopted.*

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.45. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor the Secretary to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.45, entitled “Developments in

the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”, was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 15th meeting, on 22 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.45, A/C.1/63/CRP.3** and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.3, Add.4 and Add.6.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I would now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.45.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.45, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”, first, under the terms of operative paragraph 4, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts, to be established in 2009 on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, to continue to study existing and potential threats in the sphere of information security and possible cooperative measures to address them, as well as the concepts referred to in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, and to submit a report on the results of this study to the General Assembly at its sixty-fifth session.

Pursuant to the request contained in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the group of governmental experts would hold one organizational session in Geneva in 2009 and three substantive sessions in Geneva and New York in 2010. It should be noted that holding the third session in Geneva would constitute an exception to section I, paragraph 4, of General Assembly resolution 40/243, by which the general principle is reaffirmed that, in drawing up the schedule of conferences and meetings, United Nations bodies shall plan to meet at their respective headquarters.

The conference servicing requirements for the organizational session of the group of governmental experts in 2009 have been estimated at \$149,900 at current rates, and those for the three substantive sessions in 2010 are estimated to be \$595,400 at current rates. In addition, non-conference servicing requirements — which include travel of experts and cost of consultants for the substantive servicing of the organizational session and the three substantive sessions of the proposed group of governmental

experts — have been estimated at \$146,300 at current rates for 2009 and \$461,300 at current rates for 2010.

Provisions for the requirements pertaining to the organizational session of the group of governmental experts in 2009 have been included under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management”; section 4, “Disarmament”; section 28 D, “Office of Central Support Services”; and section 28 E, “Administration, Geneva”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

The conference servicing and non-conference servicing requirements for the three substantive sessions of the group of governmental experts in 2010 would be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.45 and establish the previously mentioned group of governmental experts in 2009, no programme budget implications would arise in the biennium 2008-2009.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia

(Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, 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, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.45 was adopted by 167 votes to 1.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate recorded votes have also been requested operative paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5 (b), 5 as a whole and 7. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51, entitled "Transparency in armaments", was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the 15th meeting, on 22 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.51 and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.1*, Add.3, Add.4, Add.5*, Add.6 and Add.7.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I would now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51.

By paragraph 5 (b) of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be convened in 2009, within

available resources, on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the views expressed by Member States and the reports of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, with a view to taking a decision at its sixty-fourth session. By paragraph 6, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to implement the recommendations contained in his 2000, 2003 and 2006 reports on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development and to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for the Secretariat to operate and maintain the Register.

Pursuant to the request contained in paragraph 5 (b) of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the panel of governmental experts would hold three sessions, one in Geneva and two in New York, in 2009. The conference servicing requirements for the three sessions of the group of governmental experts in 2009 have been estimated to be \$562,500 at current rates. In addition, the non-conference servicing requirements have been estimated at \$507,000, which includes the travel of experts and the cost of a consultant, along with general temporary assistance. Those requirements have been included under section 2, "General Assembly and economic and social affairs and conference management"; section 4, "Disarmament"; and section 28 (d), "Office of Central Support Services", of the programme budget for the current biennium 2008-2009.

Regarding the request contained in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, resources to ensure the continuing operation and maintenance of the Register have been included under section 4, "Disarmament", of the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51, no additional requirements would arise for the programme budget for the current biennium 2008-2009.

The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provision of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with 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 (A/54/7) of the Advisory Committee on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001, 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 that phrase in resolutions and decisions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will first vote on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Paragraph 2 was retained by 143 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

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

The Chairperson: The Committee will now vote on paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Paragraph 3 was retained by 143 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now vote on paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia,

Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Paragraph 4 was retained by 143 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now vote on paragraph 5 (b) of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan,

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Paragraph 5 (b) was retained by 143 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now vote on paragraph 5, as a whole, of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Paragraph 5, as a whole, was retained by 143 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Operative paragraph 7 was retained by 143 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51 was adopted by 144 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

The Chairperson: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to make statements in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Aly (Egypt): I have taken the floor to explain my country's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments".

Owing to a number of conceptual inaccuracies embodied in the draft resolution, Egypt abstained in the voting on it. In addition to disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control agreements, the draft refers to other commitments that are not clearly described. The draft resolution also refers to compliance enforcement, which, we believe, is a matter related to each relevant disarmament and arms control agreement and the system, if any, that it establishes to follow up on the issue of compliance. We in no way acknowledge the right of one or more States to enforce the compliance of another outside United Nations institutions and the authority and mechanisms provided for by the relevant agreements.

Egypt also has strong reservations regarding the concept embodied in the eighth preambular paragraph, which calls for effective national capacities for verification and enforcement, since Egypt believes that verification capacities and enforcement relate only to international organizations created by relevant treaty regimes and do not lie with individual States.

Finally, paragraphs 4 and 6 call for action to encourage compliance. It is not clear whether the action foreseen is by military or other means. If such called-for action is envisaged in the draft resolution as including military action, Egypt would not be in a position to accept such a legally unjustified appeal. We thus decided to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. Rao (India): I have taken the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments".

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

States also arise from obligations that they have undertaken voluntarily, in exercise of their sovereign decisions.

We would, however, like to place on record our understanding that States, in encouraging compliance by other States with the disarmament, non-proliferation and arms limitation agreements to which they are parties, shall act in accordance with the compliance mechanisms provided for in the relevant agreements and in a manner consistent with the United Nations Charter and international law.

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

We would also like to emphasize the significance of multilateralism in addressing issues that may arise in relation to non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments. Furthermore, it is our understanding that other agreed obligations imply only those obligations that have been undertaken by States with their sovereign consent.

Mr. Litavrin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I have taken the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments".

We abstained in the voting on the draft resolution. We regret to note that its content echoes that of a similar document submitted two years ago. The changes introduced this year do not change the document's substance. The present draft resolution upsets the balance between non-proliferation and disarmament, resulting in a non-objective assessment of the relationship between the obligations of States under their respective international treaties. We must also note that the current draft resolution reflects significant amendments as compared with an earlier draft resolution that Russia co-sponsored.

In particular, draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1 makes no reference to the role of the United Nations, the Security Council, international organizations or international diplomacy and is effectively limited to

punishing non-compliance with treaties. There is almost no mention of the significance of multinational obligations in the area of enhancing international security. Clearly, the main targets of the measures set out in the draft resolution for non-compliance with non-proliferation obligations are the so-called pariah States.

The evocation of possible punishment of the guilty conflicts somewhat with the appeals to strengthen the capacity of national compliance and verification mechanisms and to assist States lacking resources of their own. The draft resolution suggests a totally arbitrary interpretation of the recommendations of the panel of government experts on verification. In particular, it makes no mention of the importance of the legally binding verification mechanisms of multilateral treaties based on objective criteria. Indeed, such mechanisms were a key recommendation of the panel.

We hope that, in the time available before the next session, the authors of the draft resolution will conduct consultations aimed at providing balance to the important theme of compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament treaties. That would enable this draft resolution to enjoy the broadest possible support.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.43*, entitled "Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities". We believe that the text duly takes into account the proposals presented by Cuba in the course of the consultations on the draft. The wording of the draft resolution could be improved and should be finalized when it is considered again in two years. Nonetheless, we acknowledge that the adopted text is much more balanced and precise than that originally proposed by the main authors of the initiative.

While we supported the draft resolution, which dealt with an important topic, we believe it necessary to express our position on A/C.1/63/L.43* for the record.

First, the second preambular paragraph, although improved, still reflects a rather simplistic approach to the cause-and-effect relationship between illicit brokering and sustainable economic and social development. We hope that this wording will be reconsidered in the future.

Secondly, we have accepted paragraph 2 on the understanding that it refers to the implementation by States of those treaties and instruments to which they are parties and that have undertaken their obligations by sovereign decision. We also believe that paragraph 2 can in no way be interpreted as granting legitimacy to instruments that, in Cuba's opinion, are not fully consistent with the Charter of the United Nations and international law.

Thirdly and lastly, as is explicitly acknowledged in the draft resolution, we wish to emphasize that initiatives to prevent and combat illicit brokering activities should not hinder international cooperation with respect to materials, equipment and technology used for peaceful purposes.

Mr. Ruddyard (Indonesia): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its position on draft resolutions A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1 and A/C.1/63/L.43*.

With regard to A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1, Indonesia acknowledges the importance of compliance with the agreements and other agreed obligations and commitments undertaken in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. We agree with the draft resolution that non-compliance with disarmament and non-proliferation agreements and commitments may affect the security of States parties. That could create a security risk for other States relying on the constraints and commitments stipulated in those agreements.

We also believe that, without compliance with those agreements and commitments that States have undertaken, the treaty regime may be weakened. It could become ineffective, and that could be a disincentive for some States to remain in the regime. We are therefore keen to see all States parties to any agreement faithfully comply with the entirety of all provisions of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation obligations and commitments.

We note that some amendments have been made by the sponsors. We would have preferred a clearer reference to compliance with the entirety of all provisions, including nuclear disarmament obligations, commitments and undertakings. We believe that compliance in the context of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation should be addressed in a balanced manner. Both merit equal attention.

We hope that our support and flexibility, based on good faith, as shown by our position on this draft

resolution, will be reciprocated by the sponsors of the draft resolution. We hope that this spirit will spread and lead to corresponding commitment, action and greater flexibility in the future, particularly on the issue of nuclear disarmament, in order to enable my delegation to support this draft resolution in the future.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.43*, we appreciate the initiative of the Republic of Korea and Australia to introduce a draft resolution on illicit brokering activities as a means to further raise awareness within the international community of the importance of curbing those activities.

We commend the authors, which have conducted intensive consultations in a transparent manner. Those consultations and the subsequent changes addressed most issues of concern to my delegation. The conceptual unclearness in the earlier version does not exist any longer. Consistency has been maintained and vague wording removed. The important principles are intact. Considering that this is a new draft resolution, we appreciate the fact that the authors have chosen to take a step-by-step approach and have presented a more modest version of the steps ahead.

In considering the draft resolution, we were guided by the principle that any control in the transfer of materials, equipment and technology, including through control of brokering activities, should in no way hamper international cooperation for peaceful purposes and for legitimate trade. As a developing country that relies on trade and transfers of technology for its continued development, Indonesia is keen to avoid undue restrictions on them when they are purely for peaceful purposes. We note that the draft resolution underlines that important principle.

In line with the third preambular paragraph and paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, we consider all brokering activities to be illegal when they operate beyond the regulation provided by the State, including the requirement of brokering agencies to receive certification by the relevant Government agencies. Those include brokering activities that provide services in the acquisition of conventional weapons, as well as in the provision of materials, equipments and technology.

Ms. Charbel (Lebanon) (*spoke in Arabic*): I wish to explain my vote on the draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments", contained in document A/C.1/63/L.51.

The League of Arab States wishes to reconfirm its position in particular on the Register of Conventional Arms. The views of the members of the League of Arab States on transparency in armaments have been well known for years. The League of Arab States is committed to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, which is based on the international disarmament agenda, with particular emphasis on the situation in the Middle East.

The member States of the League of Arab States support transparency in the field of armaments as a means to enhance international peace and security. If we are to make any machinery transparent, we must be guided by the basic principles of balance, transparency and non-discrimination, which enhance the security of all countries at the national, regional and international levels in accordance with international law. The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms is the first, overdue attempt on the part of the international community to address this issue at the international level.

We cannot question the value of the Register as a confidence-building measure and early warning mechanism, but it has certain weaknesses that have ensured that only half the United Nations Member States have provided it with information. We also believe it necessary to widen the scope of the Register, especially since the experience of recent years has shown it to be effectively limited to seven categories of conventional weapons. There are countries, including some among the Arab League, that consider the Register inadequate to respond to their security needs. Their future cooperation will depend on the willingness of the members of the international community to provide more effective confidence-building and transparency measures.

We believe that the scope of the Register, established pursuant to resolution 46/36 L, should be widened to include advanced conventional weapons, weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, and advanced technology with military applications. That would make the Register more balanced and comprehensive and less discriminating, allowing it systematically to attract more participants.

The Middle East, where transparency and confidence-building can be achieved only through a balanced approach towards weapons, is a special case in that respect. In the Middle East, applying the

principle of transparency to the seven categories of conventional weapons, while disregarding advanced and more lethal weapons, such as weapons of mass destruction and nuclear weapons, is an approach that is neither balanced nor comprehensive and will not achieve the desired results, especially since the Register does not take into account the situation in our region, where Israel continues its occupation of the Arab territories. Israel possesses the most lethal weapons of mass destructions and is the only State in the region that is not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It disregards the repeated calls of the international community to accede to the Treaty and to subject its nuclear facilities to the full-scope safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The failure to broaden the Register to include arms stockpiles and weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, would prove it to be a failure and thus, in its present form, inadequate as an effective confidence-building measure and as an early warning mechanism. The members of the League of Arab States therefore abstained in the voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. Hallak (Syria) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation will explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/63/L.32/Rev.1, "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments", and A/C.1/63/L.51, "Transparency in armaments".

With regard to non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63L.32/Rev.1, introduced by the delegation of the United States of America, for the following reasons.

First, it is unreasonable for us to vote on a draft resolution that calls for compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments while Israel, which possesses nuclear weapons, refuses to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and continues to threaten regional peace and security in the Middle East. Israel is a sponsor of this draft resolution, which undermines its moral credibility, particularly as in paragraph 4 it calls upon all concerned States "to hold those not in compliance with such agreements

accountable for their non-compliance". As we all know, Israel is one of those States.

Secondly, the issue of compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments is important, as the draft resolution emphasizes and my delegation recognize. Nevertheless, compliance requires provisions to ensure that all States respect the non-proliferation agreements to which they are party, including the NPT. Unfortunately, that principle is not respected by some of the sponsors.

Thirdly, the draft resolution makes no mention whatsoever of the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the Conference on Disarmament, which makes it logically less balanced and functional. We need to coordinate the activities of the United Nations in New York, the IAEA in Vienna and the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

I turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51 on transparency in armaments. The delegation of Syria fully supports the position of the member States of the League of Arab States on transparency in armaments. My delegation also expresses its full support for the global trend towards creating a society free of the use or threat of us of force and based on the principles and purposes of the Charter, which is founded on justice, equality and peace. We affirm that we are ready to participate in any international effort that seeks in good will to achieve that objective.

However, we draw the Committee's attention to the fact that the draft resolution on transparency in armaments does not take into account the special situation in the Middle East. The Arab-Israeli conflict persists because of Israel still occupies Arab territories, refuses to implement the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, continues to be armed by some great Powers and possesses the most hi-tech and lethal conventional weapons. It also has the capacity to manufacture and stockpile other advanced weapons, including nuclear weapons.

Mr. Guimarães (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.43*, entitled "Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities".

We joined the consensus on the draft resolution because we fully support the objective of eradicating illicit brokering activities, especially with regard to

small arms and light weapons. Furthermore, we remain committed to the objectives set out in Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) and to the efforts of the international community to prevent terrorists from gaining access to weapons of mass destruction.

However, the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution seeks to consolidate the definition that illicit brokering activities encompass not only conventional weapons but also “materials, equipment and technology that could contribute to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery”. Paragraph 3 proposes that we deal with the issue through the establishment of “appropriate national laws and/or measures”. That approach poses some difficulties for my delegation.

First, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the illicit brokering in conventional arms are fundamentally distinct phenomena. There is a licit role for conventional arms, whereas there is none for weapons of mass destruction.

Secondly, we remain unconvinced of the usefulness of the concept of illicit brokering in materials, equipment and technologies that could contribute to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, as stated in the draft resolution. It seems either unnecessary, as all activities that directly lead to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction are inherently illegal, or too broad, if it seeks to include all potential dual-use goods and technologies that have legitimate peaceful uses.

Thirdly, as we have stressed on several occasions, Brazil supports the establishment of a legally binding instrument to address the issue of illicit brokering in small arms and light weapons. Relying on national measures alone is clearly insufficient. In that regard, we remain committed to the goal of concluding a legally binding instrument on illicit brokering in small arms, as stated by Brazil on behalf of the members of the Common Market of the South and associated States in the thematic debate pertaining to conventional arms.

Mr. Belourian (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation decided to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.51, entitled “Transparency in armaments”. That is consistent with our principled position in recent years of advocating a more comprehensive approach to transparency in armaments.

We have repeatedly stated that transparency in conventional arms without transparency in weapons of mass destruction is imbalanced and lacks comprehensiveness, in particular in the sensitive region of the Middle East, where the only non-party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) continues to develop nuclear weapons and other kinds of weapons of mass destruction.

Resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991, as the basis of the whole initiative and the main frame of reference on the subject, has not been fully and faithfully implemented. After more than a decade of operation of the United Nations Register, the current draft resolution only recalls and makes a brief reference to resolution 46/36 L, while the Register was supposed to be a first step towards initiating transparency in all kinds of armaments, including weapons of mass destruction and, in particular, nuclear weapons.

My delegation hopes that, in the future, thorough and comprehensive transparency in armaments will include all kinds of armaments, in particular weapons of mass destruction, and be pursued by the General Assembly, as recommended by the Group of Governmental Experts in 2000.

The Chairperson: The Committee has thus concluded its action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 6 in informal paper 3.

We turn now to cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”. The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56, entitled “Convention on Cluster Munitions”. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56, entitled “Convention on Cluster Munitions”, was introduced by the representative of Ireland at the Committee’s 15th meeting, on 22 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/63/L.56.

With the Chairperson’s permission, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General with regard to the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56.

By paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to

provide such services as may be necessary to fulfil the tasks entrusted to him by the Convention. In accordance with paragraph 1 of article 14 of the Convention, the costs of the meetings of the States parties would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating therein in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately.

Following the established practice, the Secretariat will prepare respective cost estimates for the approval of the States parties, following planning missions to assess the requirements for conference facilities and services. In accordance with paragraph 2 of article 14 of the Convention, the costs incurred by the Secretary-General under articles 7 and 8 of the Convention would be borne by the States parties to the Convention in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately. The Secretariat will prepare respective costs estimates for the approval of the States parties.

It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties under their respective legal arrangements are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations. Those activities would be undertaken by the Secretariat only after sufficient funding is received, in advance, from States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in the meetings.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56 would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the current biennium 2008-2009.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56 was adopted.

The Chairperson: I now call on those representatives wishing to speak in explanation of position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Ms. Radian-Gordon (Israel): I would like to express Israel's position regarding draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56, entitled "Convention on Cluster Munitions".

Israel welcomes the negotiations that have taken place within the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (CCW) on a new protocol addressing the use of cluster munitions. We believe that these discussions have been fruitful so far and have the potential to yield an agreed text by the end of this year. This text could be significant to all relevant States, thus providing an effective answer to the humanitarian concerns raised by cluster munitions.

The CCW has consistently and successfully strived to reach the necessary balance between military and humanitarian considerations. By doing so, the CCW is recognized as the most appropriate forum for dealing with relevant issues in the conventional weapons sphere.

Israel remains unconvinced as to the actual contribution made by discussing the issue of cluster munitions in other forums. It is our position that independent initiatives conducted outside the scope of the United Nations do not necessarily contribute to the stability and effectiveness of global arms control goals. In fact, such initiatives have the potential to undermine serious negotiations held in forums mandated for such negotiations.

Israel trusts and hopes that States that have participated in other negotiations on cluster munitions will do their utmost to move the negotiations held within the CCW along, so that an agreed text may emerge from the November negotiations.

Ms. Kwek (Singapore): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's decision to go along with the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56, entitled "Convention on Cluster Munitions".

Singapore supports and will continue to support all initiatives against the indiscriminate use of cluster munitions, especially when they are directed at innocent and defenceless civilians. At the same time, Singapore believes that humanitarian considerations must be balanced with a State's legitimate security concerns and the right to self-defence.

In this context, Singapore supports this draft resolution and other ongoing international efforts to resolve humanitarian concerns over cluster munitions. We will work with members of the international

community towards finding a durable and truly global solution.

Mr. Rao (India): I have taken the floor to explain my country's position on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.56, entitled "Convention on Cluster Munitions".

India was not a participant at the Dublin Diplomatic Conference for the Adoption of the Convention on Cluster Munitions. Therefore, the consideration of this draft resolution by this Committee cannot be construed as endorsement of the outcome of that Conference.

India supports further consideration of this issue by the Group of Governmental Experts as part of the process associated with the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, in accordance with its mandate to strike a balance between military necessity and humanitarian considerations.

Mr. Litavrin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We are speaking on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56, entitled "Convention on Cluster Munitions".

We did not object to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56 by consensus out of respect for agreements by States aimed at enhancing international humanitarian law and reducing unnecessary human casualties and suffering both during and after armed conflicts. We also understand the reasons why many countries intend to refrain from the use of cluster munitions in military operations.

However, we have to point out that the military-political environment and current threats to security do not allow all States to take such a decision. Since cluster munitions are considered by Russia to be a legal and effective type of weapon that is not prohibited by the norms of international humanitarian law, we are also convinced that attempts to define them into good, smart and high-tech weapons and bad, dumb and ineffective weapons are unjustified.

We believe that resolving the problem related to cluster munitions should be achieved in step by step within the framework of existing international multilateral disarmament mechanisms and with the participation of principal manufacturers and users of

such weapons. In our view, the appropriate forum is the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. It has shown in practice its capacity to reach balanced decisions on the basis of expert opinion, while taking adequate account of the interests of all concerned parties.

Mr. Aly (Egypt): The delegation of Egypt joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56, entitled "Convention on Cluster Munitions", in the light of the procedural nature of the draft. However, Egypt would like to place on the record that its joining consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56 should not in any way be interpreted as support for the substantive content of the Convention or the process that led to its conclusion outside the United Nations framework.

Mr. Kim Bonghyun (Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56, entitled "Convention on Cluster Munitions".

The Government of the Republic of Korea fully shares the concerns of the international community over the humanitarian impact of cluster munitions. We also support global efforts to address the humanitarian problems arising from cluster munitions and therefore have joined the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus. However, due to the unique security situation on the Korean peninsula, my Government is not able to take an active stance on the Convention on Cluster Munitions, which bans the use of all cluster munitions.

Nonetheless, in an effort to join the global endeavour to reduce humanitarian suffering from cluster munitions, my Government has been actively participating in consultations on cluster munitions within the framework of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (CCW), in which due consideration is given to the military utility of cluster munitions as well as their humanitarian impacts. Since major producers, users and stockpilers of cluster munitions have participated in the CCW negotiations, we believe that it can bring about an international instrument that can effectively and significantly reduce the humanitarian impacts of cluster munitions.

My delegation would also like to share with member States that the Ministry of National Defence of the Republic of Korea adopted in August 2008 a new directive on cluster munitions. According to this new directive, only cluster munitions that are equipped with self-deactivation devices and that would not result in more than a 1-per cent failure rate can be included in future defence acquisition plans. The new directive also recommends the development of alternative weapon systems that could replace cluster munitions in the longer term.

The Republic of Korea will continue to engage in the international process on cluster munitions in an active and constructive manner to mitigate the humanitarian problems associated with the use of cluster munitions.

Mr. Wang Qun (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China joined the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56. That does not mean that China recognizes the Dublin Convention. China did not participate in the negotiating process leading to the Convention. I should like to emphasize that China supports efforts within the framework of the United Nations, especially in the context of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. Efforts should continue to be made to hold negotiations on reducing the humanitarian effects of cluster munitions and to reach an agreement as soon as possible that is acceptable to all sides.

Mr. Tarar (Pakistan): I have requested the floor to explain our position with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56.

Like other delegations, we joined the consensus on the draft resolution, *inter alia*, because of the procedural nature of the text. We remain convinced that the Dublin Convention, albeit useful, continues to be an extra-United Nations mechanism. In our view, it represents a tendency that does not redound to the benefit of multilateralism. We feel that the process should supplement, and not supplant, the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons process.

Ms. Fedorovich (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): I should like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56.

We joined the consensus on the draft resolution because we share the humanitarian concerns with regard to the use of cluster munitions, in particular

their use against non-combatants and civilian infrastructure, in violation of the principles of international humanitarian law. We also understand the decision of many countries to refrain from using cluster weapons. However, we are convinced that the development of new international instruments should take place in a phased and open manner. International agreements that do not take into account the main manufacturers and users of such weapons could have a negative impact on the universality and viability of future agreements. We believe that the Conference on Disarmament remains the most acceptable forum to achieve agreement on this issue.

Mr. Marrakchi (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): My delegation joined the consensus on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/63/L.56, primarily because of the procedural nature of the draft and in order to illustrate Morocco's constructive participation in the Dublin Diplomatic Conference and the preparations for it, as well as to reflect our awareness of the importance of addressing this issue.

Nevertheless, my delegation would like to underscore that the matter of a convention on cluster munitions merits in-depth consideration in the context of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and in the relevant mandated forums in that regard, so as to achieve an instrument that ensures a balance between purely humanitarian aspects and military considerations. My delegation would therefore like to clarify that our joining the consensus on the draft resolution in no way prejudices our national position in this area, which is yet to be defined by our relevant national authorities.

The Chairperson: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of position following the adoption of the draft resolutions under this cluster. We have thus concluded our consideration of the draft resolutions and decisions under the three clusters listed in informal paper 3.

The Committee will now consider the two draft resolutions listed under cluster 7 in informal paper 3. I shall first give the floor to delegations that wish to make general statements under that cluster.

Mr. Obisakin (Nigeria): I again take the floor on behalf of the African Group.

We would like to thank all delegations for their assistance to Africa last year with regard to the draft

resolution that this year is contained in document A/C.1/63/L.50/Rev.1*. All the technical amendments have been brought to bear. The sponsoring member States would like to urge the First Committee to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

As our peoples say, the dry season is the time to identify the best source of water, because it will last. This is a time when Africa needs all the assistance it can get. The strength of a chain lies at its weakest point. We do not hope always to be the weakest, but this will make us stronger.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.49, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services", the sponsors and my own delegation of Nigeria express the hope that it will be adopted by consensus, for we believe that it provides continuity and will produce the future experts of the First Committee.

Mr. Kim Bonghyun (Republic of Korea): I should just briefly like to add a word of support for the general statement delivered by the representative of Nigeria.

As an alumnus, I would like to speak on behalf of the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme. I think that education is how we pass on a set of values to the next generation. It is also how we create a group of trained and disciplined experts who can work towards the same ideals. I believe that today I could find examples in this room of the true spirit of cooperation among fellows in adopting draft resolutions. I would like to express my gratitude for the Fellowship Programme and the fellows' spirit of cooperation.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.49. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.49, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 18th meeting, on 27 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.49, A/C.1/63/CRP.3** and A/C.1/63/CRP.3/Add.3, Add.4, Add.5* and Add.6.

The Chairperson: 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.1/63/L.49 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.50/Rev.1. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.50/Rev.1*, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 18th meeting, on 27 October 2008. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/63/L.50/Rev.1* and A/C.1/63/CRP.3**.

With the permission of the Chairperson, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.50/Rev.1*.

Under the terms of operative paragraphs 6 and 7 of draft resolution A/c.1/63/L.50/Rev.1*, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to facilitate closer cooperation between the Regional Centre and the African Union, in particular in the areas of peace, security and development, and to continue to provide the necessary support to the Regional Centre for better achievements and results.

The implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 6 would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, "Disarmament", of the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. As concerns operative paragraph 7, provision under section 4, "Disarmament", of the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 covers one P-5 post for the Director of the Centre, one P-3 post, two local-level posts and general operating expenses. The programme activities of the Regional Centre would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.50/Rev.1*, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly

entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

The Chairperson: 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.1/63/L.50/Rev.1 was adopted.*

The Chairperson: I now call on the representative of the United States of America, who wishes to speak in explanation of position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Larson (United States of America): I would like to provide an explanation of position on draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.50/Rev.1*.

The United States supports the efforts of nations to work among themselves to solve regional problems, and we believe that United Nations regional centres can facilitate such work. However, we continue to believe that funding for the centres should come from voluntary contributions, as it has since they were created.

Last year, we opposed in the First Committee a proposal to include in the United Nations regular budget funding for operating costs and three new posts in the African Centre. While we abstained in the voting on this issue in the General Assembly, our position that the Centre should be funded from voluntary contributions has not changed.

The Chairperson: We have heard the only speaker in explanation of vote.

I call on the representative of Lithuania, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. May I remind representatives that statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and 5 minutes for the second.

Mr. Baublys (Lithuania): My delegation wishes to speak in exercise of its right of reply with regard to the explanations of vote delivered by one delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/63/L.36 and L.37, particularly that related to the outcome of the Biennial Meeting of States held in July 2008.

Seven hundred forty thousand people are killed each year, 20,000 each day and 85 each hour. If the Final Outcome Document of the Biennial Meeting of States led to tangible actions that saved lives, my delegation and, I believe, many others are proud of that result and owe it to thousands of individuals from every country represented here; from international, regional and subregional organizations; from civil society and from academic institutions.

It is unfortunate that someone has chosen to overlook that sacrifice and commitment and found it convenient to place blame on procedures. It is disingenuous for that delegation to claim that the leadership of the Biennial Meeting of States failed; it was quite the opposite. The whole United Nations membership did not fail to achieve general agreement on substantive matters in the most dynamic, open, productive, transparent and inclusive manner. In fact, for the record, the delegation that abstained in the voting regarding the Biennial Meeting of States held in July was among those delegations that were consulted the most. The process was open, transparent and inclusive and involved everyone. Moreover, at the Biennial Meeting, that delegation proposed a host of amendments to the Outcome Document. Those amendments were accepted, and yet that delegation has chosen to claim otherwise.

The Chairperson: We have heard the only speaker in exercise of the right of reply.

The Committee has thus taken action on all draft resolutions set out in informal paper 3.

As I stated earlier, draft resolution A/C.1/63/L.56, on which the Committee has already taken action, should be omitted from informal paper 4, which is before members. Tomorrow, therefore, the Committee will take action on 13 draft resolutions, as well as the programme of work set out in document A/C.1/63/CRP.5, which is also before the Committee. No budgetary or financing documentation is missing. I hope to finish tomorrow by noon. I ask for the support of members in that regard.

I should now like to refer to the note on the 2009 proposed programme of work and timetable for the First Committee. As the Committee is aware, we have been taking action on all draft resolutions and decisions. We still have to consider those under agenda item 110, with regard to the revitalization of the work

of the General Assembly. At this point, I should just like to make a few remarks.

A/C.1/63/CRP.5, which has already been discussed by the members of the Bureau, was prepared following consultations with the Chairperson of the Fourth Committee. It was agreed that both the First and Fourth Committees would begin their work during the first week of the session, as has always been done in the past. However, the Fourth Committee has agreed to allow our Committee to use the time allocated for both its morning and afternoon meetings on Tuesday, 20 October. The total number of meetings allocated remains the same as during this session. The allocation of meetings has been adjusted somewhat, however, with fewer meetings devoted to the general debate and a bit more time for the thematic segment on clusters.

The First Committee's experience during the past two sessions has been that there are fewer speakers in the general debate and more under the thematic cluster debate. That adjustment will allow members to have a little more time for an interactive segment during the next session. As was the case this year, the deadline for the submission of all draft resolutions and decisions will be on Thursday of the second week.

As tomorrow will be our last meeting — I hope — I intend to put document A/C.1/63/CRP.5 before the Committee for adoption. Of course, the draft programme will be finalized and issued in its final form before the Committee starts its substantive work at its next session in 2009. We will look further into the work programme tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.