



General Assembly

Sixty-fifth session

First Committee

21st meeting

Thursday, 28 October 2010, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

:

Chair: Mr. Miloš Koterec (Slovakia)

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

Agenda items 88 to 104 and 162 (continued)

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

The Chair: I shall first give the floor to those delegations that did not have the opportunity to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions adopted yesterday under cluster 4.

Mr. Sydykov (Kyrgyzstan) (*spoke in Russian*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/65/L.8, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". The Kyrgyz delegation welcomes the adoption of the draft resolution, which constitutes one more positive sign of the attitude of States towards the Convention, including those that are not yet parties to it.

Although Kyrgyzstan is not yet a State party to the Ottawa Convention owing to legal reasons related to the maintenance of our national security, at this session the new leadership of Kyrgyzstan considered the possibility of changing its position and voted in favour of the draft resolution, thereby reaffirming our commitment to the humanitarian goals of the Ottawa Convention. We must stress that Kyrgyzstan intends to implement some of those provisions. The Kyrgyz Republic does not import, produce or export anti-personnel mines and has often stressed in various

forums its full and wholehearted support of the spirit of the Ottawa Convention. We believe that the Convention will continue to play an important role in alleviating the suffering of people affected by anti-personnel mines.

Mr. Aly (Egypt): I take the floor to explain Egypt's vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/65/L.8, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". Egypt abstained from voting on the draft resolution due to the particular nature of the Ottawa Convention, which was developed and concluded outside the multilateral context of the United Nations and without providing the necessary requirements to ensure either its potential universality or its effectiveness.

Egypt acknowledges the humanitarian considerations that the Ottawa Convention attempts to embody. Since the 1980s and long before the conclusion of the Ottawa Convention itself, Egypt has imposed, based on the same considerations, a moratorium on its landmine production and export. However, Egypt views the Convention as lacking balance between the humanitarian considerations related to anti-personnel mines and their legitimate military use for border protection.

Most important, the Convention fails to acknowledge the legal responsibility of States for removing anti-personnel mines that they have laid, in particular in other States' territories, thus making it

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



almost impossible for affected States to meet the Convention's demining requirements alone. This is particularly true in the case of Egypt, which still has millions of anti-personnel mines on its territory that were planted by Second World War Powers. That requires vast demining resources well beyond Egypt's existing capabilities, even when current cooperation frameworks — which we take positive note of — are included.

The weaknesses I have mentioned are compounded by the Ottawa Convention's feeble international cooperation system, which remains limited in its effect and is greatly dependent upon the will of donor States. The Convention's weaknesses have also served to keep the world's largest producers and some of the most heavily affected States outside its regime. That has put into question the Convention's potential universality and reminds us all of the value of concluding arms-control and disarmament agreements in the context of the United Nations, and not outside its framework.

Ms. Skorpen (Norway): My delegation joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.44*, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects". But we would like to reiterate the point made during the thematic debate that the Convention should not spend time addressing topics that have already been covered in established instruments, such as the Mine Ban Convention and the Convention on Cluster Munitions. Rather, it should devote time to considering where it can actually add value to international humanitarian law.

Ms. Ng Li Jia (Singapore): I take the floor to explain my delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/65/L.8, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". Singapore's position on anti-personnel mines has been clear and open. Singapore will continue to support all initiatives against the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines, especially when they are directed against innocent and defenceless civilians. With that in mind, in May 1996, Singapore declared a two-year moratorium on the export of anti-personnel landmines that do not contain self-neutralizing mechanisms. In February 1998, Singapore expanded

the moratorium to include all manner of anti-personnel landmines, not just those without self-neutralizing mechanisms, and extended the moratorium indefinitely.

At the same time, like several other countries, Singapore firmly affirms that legitimate security concerns and the right to self-defence of any State cannot be disregarded. A blanket ban on all types of anti-personnel landmines might therefore be counterproductive. Singapore supports international efforts to resolve the humanitarian concerns over anti-personnel mines. We will continue to work with members of the international community towards finding a durable and truly global solution.

Mr. Eloumni (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): I take the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.8, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

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

Morocco has expressed its support for the universal momentum in favour of eliminating anti-personnel mines by ratifying the Amended Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices in March 2002 and by regularly submitting, since 2003, a national report on the implementation of the provisions of the Protocol.

In the same spirit, Morocco implements the provisions of the Ottawa Convention with regard to mine clearance, the destruction of stockpiles, awareness-raising, training and assistance to victims of anti-personnel mines. In that regard, I wish to highlight the following.

The Royal Armed Forces have carried out remarkable demining efforts that have made possible the collection and destruction of more than 100,000 anti-tank mines and nearly 90,000 anti-personnel

mines. Moroccan authorities have assumed responsibility for the treatment of victims and for their medical, social and economic rehabilitation. Morocco has provided ongoing demining support to countries in the region and has maintained a constant dialogue with non-governmental organizations on achieving the objectives of the Convention.

Since 2006, the Kingdom of Morocco has regularly submitted a voluntary report, in accordance with article 7 of the Ottawa Convention, on measures taken pursuant to the provisions of the Convention. In the same spirit, Morocco, which regularly participates in the meetings of States parties to the Convention, took part in the second Review Conference of the States Parties, held in Cartagena de Indias, Colombia. The Kingdom of Morocco's adherence to the Ottawa Convention is a strategic objective that is linked to our security needs with respect to maintaining our territorial integrity.

Mr. Rao (India): I have asked for the floor to explain India's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.8, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". India abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

India supports the vision of a world free of the threat of anti-personnel landmines. In 1997, India discontinued the production of non-detectable anti-personnel mines, and since then has observed a moratorium on their transfer.

India is party to Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which enshrines the approach of taking into account the legitimate defence requirements of States, especially those with long borders. The availability of militarily effective alternative technologies that can cost-effectively perform the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines will considerably facilitate the goal of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines.

India remains committed to increased international cooperation and assistance for mine clearance and the rehabilitation of mine victims, and is willing to contribute technical assistance and expertise to that end. Since the Nairobi Review Conference of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, India has participated in all meetings of States parties as an

observer. India also participated in the Review Conference held in Cartagena last year. We intend to continue our participation in the meetings of the Convention as an observer.

Mrs. Diallo (Mali) (*spoke in French*): This is not an explanation of vote for Mali, but rather an expression of thanks.

On behalf of the member States of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), my delegation welcomes the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.11, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them". That adoption without a vote shows that the question of small arms and light weapons remains an important issue for general and complete disarmament. Far from being a matter of interest only to West Africa or Africa, this issue continues to occupy an important place in the concerns of the international community.

That is why my delegation would like to take this opportunity to thank, on behalf of the member States of ECOWAS, all the countries that supported the draft resolution. We also thank all the delegations that yesterday joined the consensus on the draft resolution.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the Secretariat for its constant availability and assistance.

Mr. Aljaedi (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.44*, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects", as well as to explain our reasons for joining the consensus on it.

However, Libya's support for the draft resolution does not mean that we totally accept all the provisions of the Convention, as it does not address certain issues that are of genuine concern to us, in particular that of explosive remnants of war, including landmines laid by parties to conflict in other countries, such as mine, during the Second World War. Moreover, it is important to take into account a country's right to self-defence with appropriate means.

We also share the international community's views on the harmful effects of conventional weapons. However, resolving this issue requires sincere international cooperation and a transparent and flexible

approach to the task, taking into account the concerns of all parties. It is important to find positive solutions in order to put an end to the legacy of explosive remnants of war left by colonial Powers on other countries' territories during past wars.

We also need to find appropriate ways to prevent any attacks or threats of attacks on small countries by eliminating all weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, which pose the greatest threat to human life.

Mr. Tarar (Pakistan): We have requested the floor to explain our vote on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", which is contained in document A/C.1/65/L.8.

Landmines continue to play a significant role in the defence needs of many States, especially those in regions of conflict and disputes. Pakistan remains committed to pursuing the objectives of a universal and non-discriminatory ban on anti-personnel mines in a manner that takes into account the legitimate defence requirements of States. Given our security requirements and the need to guard our long borders, which are not protected by any natural obstacles, the use of landmines forms an important part of our self-defence strategy. As such, it is not possible for Pakistan to agree to the demands for the complete prohibition of anti-personnel mines until such a time as viable alternatives are available. The objective of the total elimination of anti-personnel mines can best be promoted by, inter alia, making available militarily non-lethal and cost-effective alternative technologies.

Pakistan is a party to Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which regulates the use of landmines in both internal and external conflicts in order to prevent civilians from falling victim to them. We continue to implement the Protocol with the greatest earnestness. Pakistan, as one of the largest troop contributors to United Nations-led peacekeeping operations, has actively contributed to demining operations in several affected countries. We are prepared to provide training facilities to mine-affected countries. Pakistan enjoys a unique record of clearing all minefields after the three wars in South Asia. There has never been a humanitarian situation resulting from the use of those mines. We remain committed to ensuring that mines in our military

inventory never become a cause of civilian casualties in Pakistan or elsewhere in the world.

The Chair: The Committee has thus heard the last speaker is explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions adopted yesterday under cluster 4.

We shall now consider the draft resolutions and decisions submitted under cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security". Before the Committee proceeds to take action on them, however, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to make general statements, other than explanations of vote or position, or to introduce draft resolutions.

I give the floor to the representative of Pakistan to introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/65/L.4, A/C.1/65/L.6 and A/C.1/65/L.7.

Mr. Tarar (Pakistan): I take the floor to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.4, entitled "Regional disarmament"; draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.6, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels"; and draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.7, entitled "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context".

I turn first to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.4, which I would like to introduce on behalf of the delegations of Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Nepal, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Turkey and my own country, Pakistan.

While there is no denying the importance of international disarmament measures, the regional dimension is unquestionably significant as well. The promotion of security and disarmament at the regional level can redound to the benefit of those objectives at the global level. In that regard, the guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security adopted by the Disarmament Commission in 1993 can show us the way.

Keeping in view the promise of the regional approach for resolving conflicts in different regions, draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.4 takes note of proposals for disarmament at the regional and subregional levels and recognizes the link between regional disarmament and enhanced security, taking into account the specific characteristics of each region and the principle of undiminished security at the lowest level of armaments. Stressing the need for sustained efforts to achieve those objectives, the draft resolution also

affirms that regional approaches to disarmament complement each another; calls on States to conclude agreements wherever possible; welcomes initiatives towards disarmament, non-proliferation and security undertaken by some countries at the regional and subregional levels; and supports and encourages confidence-building measures. The sponsors and my delegation hope that, as at the sixty-fourth session, the draft resolution will be adopted unanimously.

Allow me now to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/65/L.6, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels", on behalf of the delegations of Belarus, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Italy, Nepal, Peru, the Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine and my own country. The draft resolution aims to promote conventional disarmament at the regional and subregional levels. Despite its significance, this issue has not received due attention or support. The international community must be sharply focused on conventional balance and arms control.

The preambular part of the draft resolution highlights several important concepts and principles, such as the crucial role of arms control in peace and security; the threats to peace in the post-Cold War era, arising mainly among States in the same region or subregion; the lowest level of armaments as a contributing factor to peace and stability; the objective of agreements on strengthening peace and security at the lowest possible levels of armaments and military forces; the special responsibility of militarily significant States and States with larger military capabilities in promoting such agreements for regional peace and security; and the objective of preventing the possibility of surprise military attacks, as well as avoiding aggression. The preambular part of the draft resolution also notes with particular interest the initiatives taken in various regions, including a number of Latin American countries, as well as the proposals for conventional arms control in South Asia. It also recognizes the relevance and value of the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe, which is described as a cornerstone of European security.

The operative part of the draft resolution, while deciding to give urgent consideration to the issue of conventional disarmament at the regional and subregional levels, requests the Conference on Disarmament to consider formulating principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements. The

sponsors look forward to the Committee's strong support for this draft resolution.

I would now like to introduce the draft resolution on confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context, contained in document A/C.1/65/L.7, on behalf of the delegations of Egypt, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Malaysia, the Philippines, the Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine, Uruguay and my own country.

In large measure, global peace and security depend on stability at the regional and subregional levels. The absence of those prerequisites spawns arms races, undermines arms control and disarmament and obstructs and complicates the peaceful settlement of disputes. Such instability also breeds poverty, despair and anger. Our introduction of this draft resolution is driven by the internationally recognized value of regional and subregional confidence-building measures. Pakistan is convinced that such measures will continue to yield peace and conflict-resolution dividends, which in turn allow States to concentrate on socio-economic development. Confidence-building measures can also create an enabling atmosphere for arms control and disarmament.

The preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution reiterate the basic purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, as well as resolution 57/337, entitled "Prevention of armed conflict". The text recognizes the need for dialogue to avert conflict and welcomes the peace processes already initiated in various regions to resolve disputes through peaceful means, bilaterally or through mediation by third parties. The draft resolution also recognizes that regions that have already developed confidence-building measures at the bilateral, subregional and regional levels in the political and military fields, including on arms control and disarmament, have greatly improved the climate of peace and security in their regions and contributed to the improvement of the socio-economic conditions of their people.

The operative paragraphs of the draft resolution call upon Member States to refrain from the use or threat of use of force and to reaffirm their commitment to the peaceful settlement of disputes under Chapter VI of the Charter. The draft resolution recalls the confidence-building measure-related ways and means elaborated in the 1993 report of the Disarmament Commission (see A/48/42, annex II) and urges Member

States to pursue them through sustained consultations and dialogue.

The draft resolution also urges States to strictly comply with all bilateral, regional and international arms control and disarmament agreements to which they are party; underlines that confidence-building measures should contribute to the objectives of strategic stability; and emphasizes that the objective of confidence-building measures should be to help to strengthen international peace and security and that such measures should be consistent with the principle of undiminished security at the lowest level of armament.

The draft resolution also encourages the promotion of bilateral and regional confidence-building measures to avoid conflict and to prevent the unintended and accidental outbreak of hostilities. And it requests the Secretary-General to submit a report to the General Assembly containing the views of Member States on confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context.

My delegation hopes that, as in the past year, the draft resolution will be unanimously adopted by the Committee.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Algeria to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.30.

Mr. Moktefi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): It is my delegation's privilege and honour today to introduce to the First Committee, under agenda item 102, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/65/L.30, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", which enjoys the sponsorship of 46 States.

Apart from technical updates, the draft resolution reflects the entire text of resolution 64/68. It commends the comprehensive and coordinated efforts undertaken by the Mediterranean States to respond to their common challenges. The main objective of those efforts is to transform the Mediterranean basin into a zone of dialogue, exchanges and cooperation in order to guarantee stability, peace and prosperity in the region. The text reaffirms that security in the Mediterranean region is closely linked to the security of the European region, as well as to international peace and security.

The document calls on all States of the Mediterranean region that have not yet done so to adhere to all of the multilaterally negotiated legal instruments related to the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. It also encourages all States of the region to favour the conditions necessary for strengthening confidence-building measures by promoting openness and transparency on all military matters. The draft also encourages the countries of the Mediterranean to further strengthen cooperation in combating terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, including the possible resort by terrorists to weapons of mass destruction. It also encourages cooperation in combating international crime and illicit arms transfers.

My delegation and the other sponsors of the draft resolution count on the support of Member States as a whole to adopt by consensus this important draft resolution, as has been the tradition in the past.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 5 in the first revision to informal paper 3. Before doing so, I shall give the floor to delegations that wish to explain their votes or positions.

Mr. Arrocha Olabuenaga (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/65/L.6, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels", specifically with regard to paragraph 2.

Mexico believes that the ongoing paralysis and current working methods of the Conference on Disarmament have made it impossible to carry out the work of developing conventional arms control principles in connection with the issues before that body. The Conference on Disarmament has demonstrated its inefficiency in responsibly addressing the challenges assigned to it. Given that situation, to include the formulation of principles on conventional arms control among its tasks would condemn that important issue to the same fate of stalemate that other disarmament processes have had the misfortune to suffer.

Lastly, the Conference is not the appropriate body to carry out such an effort, given its nature as a negotiating forum. In any case, it should be up to the Disarmament Commission to carry out that task. For those reasons, Mexico requests a separate vote on

paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, on which we will abstain.

Mr. Ferami (Islamic Republic of Iran): I take the floor to explain my delegation's position vis-à-vis our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.30, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

My delegation believes that the imposition of the inhumane blockade by the Zionist regime, especially from the Mediterranean Sea, has aggravated the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories, and especially in the Gaza Strip. This draft resolution does not reflect the actual situation in the region.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.4. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.4, entitled "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan earlier at today's meeting. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.4 and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.4.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.4 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.6. A separate recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 2. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.6, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan earlier at today's meeting. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.6 and A/C.1/65/CRP.4.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational

State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Bhutan, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Paragraph 2 was retained by 133 votes to 1, with 26 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.6 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.6, as a whole, was adopted by 162 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.7. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.7, entitled "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan earlier at today's meeting. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.7 and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.4.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.7 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/65/L.17. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/65/L.17, entitled "Maintenance of international security — good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe", was submitted by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/65/L.17.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/65/L.17 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.30. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.30, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the 16th meeting, on 21 October. The

sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.30 and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.4.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.30 was adopted.

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

Mr. Rao (India): I have asked for the floor to explain India's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.6, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels". India voted against the draft resolution.

The draft resolution requests the Conference on Disarmament to consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control. The Conference, as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has the vocation of negotiating disarmament instruments of global application. In 1993, the Disarmament Commission adopted guidelines and recommendations for regional disarmament by consensus. There is no need, therefore, for the Conference on Disarmament to engage in formulating principles on the same subject at a time when it has several other priority issues on its agenda.

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

Mr. Deyneko (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.6, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels". It is our position that regional arms control measures should uphold the main principle of equal security. Such measures should also be appropriate to the situation prevailing in each specific region.

Nonetheless, the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution refers to the relevance and value of

the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. On a number of occasions, the Russian delegation has stressed that the Treaty has become obsolete and does not reflect the actual state of affairs in Europe. The draft resolution says nothing about efforts under way to restore the viability of the conventional arms control regime in that region of the world. To that end, we proposed amendments to adapt the text to the new realities in Europe. Regrettably, they were not considered.

The Chair: The Committee has thus concluded action on cluster 5. We shall now move on to cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 6, I shall give the floor to those delegations that wish to make either general statements, other than an explanation of vote, or to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. Kim Bonghyun (Republic of Korea): I would like to make a general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.49/Rev.1, entitled "Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities". This biennial draft resolution, which the Republic of Korea and Australia first introduced at the sixty-third session, was adopted by consensus as resolution 63/67 on 2 December 2008.

We have again introduced this draft resolution at this session in order to raise awareness of the threat to international peace and security posed by illicit brokering activities, as well as to contribute to international efforts to address them. The draft resolution before us reflects recent developments and technical updates. During the past few weeks, we reached out actively to concerned countries and conducted serious consultations with interested Member States. Several concerns raised by some Member States were accommodated and reflected in the draft resolution.

Other elements and paragraphs largely remain unchanged from resolution 63/67. This year's draft enjoys the support of more than 70 sponsors, including 44 of the original sponsors. We believe that, after extensive consultations among Member States, the current draft resolution is well balanced and has achieved near-consensus. In that light, we hope, and therefore appeal to all Member States, that it will once again be adopted by consensus.

Finally, I would like to thank all our colleagues who participated in the consultations and contributed to the agreement on the text. My particular thanks go to the delegation of Australia and all of the other sponsors for their invaluable support and contributions.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Indonesia to introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/65/L.13, A/C.1/65/L.14, A/C.1/65/L.15 and A/C.1/65/L.19.

Mr. Percaya (Indonesia): On behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), I have the honour to introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/65/L.13, A/C.1/65/L.14, A/C.1/65/L.15 and A/C.1/65/L.19.

Concerning draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.13, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", the Movement is mindful of the challenges for the international community posed by development, poverty eradication and the elimination of diseases. The close relationship between disarmament and development is obvious. Indeed, money and energy spent on arms races to develop nuclear and other deadly weapons could, and should, instead be spent on promoting global development and peace.

NAM underlines the importance of following up on the implementation of the action programme adopted at the 1987 International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, and calls on everyone to support it. We emphasize the vital significance of achieving the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals. NAM hopes that the savings that could be generated by reducing growing global spending on armaments would be utilized to attain the Goals as outlined in resolution 65/1, entitled "Keeping the promise: united to achieve the Millennium Development Goals", which was the follow-up document to the Outcome of the Millennium Summit adopted in New York last month.

NAM supports greater efforts to integrate disarmament with humanitarian and development activities, and stresses the central role of the United Nations at the international level in addressing the disarmament-development relationship. In that regard, the role of the United Nations and other partners in helping developing countries when requested is also critical.

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.14, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control" is extremely important. Indeed, we all share the environment of our planet. No one can remain immune from the effects of harm done to it. The health and prosperity of future generations depend on the state in which we leave the Earth's environment. NAM underscores that international disarmament forums should take fully into account the relevant environmental norms in negotiating treaties and agreements on disarmament and arms limitation. We call on all States to contribute fully through their actions to ensuring compliance with such norms in the implementation of treaties and conventions to which they are parties.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.15, entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation", NAM underscores that multilateralism and multilaterally agreed solutions provide the only sustainable method for addressing disarmament, non-proliferation and international security issues. The Movement reaffirms the absolute validity of multilateral diplomacy and expresses its determination to promote multilateralism as an essential way to develop disarmament and arms regulation negotiations.

The Movement underscores the importance of States parties to the instruments relating to weapons of mass destruction consulting and cooperating among themselves in resolving their concerns with regard to cases of non-compliance, as well as implementation, in accordance with the procedures defined in those instruments. They should refrain from resorting to or threatening unilateral action or directing unverified non-compliance accusations against one another to resolve their concerns.

We stress the importance of preserving the existing agreements on disarmament, non-proliferation and arms regulation, which are expressions of the rules resulting from international cooperation and multilateral negotiation. NAM encourages the participation of all States in multilateral negotiations on disarmament, non-proliferation and arms regulation in a non-discriminatory and transparent manner.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.19, entitled "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium", it is the

Movement's hope that delegations will broadly support the draft resolution on this important issue, which has a grave humanitarian dimension. We are grateful to civil society bodies and non-governmental organizations that have taken up the issue of depleted uranium weapons and done so much to raise awareness about such weapons. We thank them for their work to encourage steps to end the use of depleted uranium in weapons.

While there is evidence of the consequences resulting from weapons containing uranium on humans and the environment, further research is required to fully comprehend the wide-ranging potential implications of depleted uranium weapons. Only then will we know the precise short- and long-term measures and remedies needed to tackle the effects of these dangerous weapons.

In that context, NAM encourages those Member States affected and others, as necessary, to facilitate studies and research in this area. At the same time, we invite Member States that have used weapons containing depleted uranium in armed conflicts to provide affected States with as much detail as possible with regard to the locations and amounts in which these weapons were used.

In conclusion, the Movement looks forward to the overwhelming support of the Committee for these four draft resolutions.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico to introduce an oral revision to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.52.

Mr. Arrocha (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mexico wishes to submit an oral revision to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.52, which my delegation introduced earlier in the session. In that connection paragraph 5 (c) should read as follows:

(*spoke in English*)

“To encourage the use of the Programme as a means to provide information related to progress on the implementation of nuclear disarmament measures”.

(*spoke in Spanish*)

Mexico continues to hope that the First Committee will adopt draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.52, entitled “United Nations Disarmament Information Programme”, as orally revised, without a vote.

Mr. García López-Trigo (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba fully supports the statement delivered by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement in introducing draft resolutions A/C.1/65/L.13, A/C.1/65/L.14, A/C.1/65/L.15 and A/C.1/65/L.19, entitled, respectively, “Relationship between disarmament and development”, “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”, “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation” and “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”.

The draft resolutions address issues of great importance not only to the countries of the Movement but also to the international community as a whole. Disarmament and development are two of the main challenges humankind must address, especially at a time when we are experiencing serious economic, social, food, energy and environmental crises.

In that regard, Cuba reiterates its proposal to establish a fund managed by the United Nations that would redirect half of current military expenditures towards meeting the socio-economic development requirements of countries in need.

Likewise, Cuba believes that relevant environmental standards must be duly taken into account in international disarmament forums during the negotiation of international arms controls and treaties, as set out in draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.14.

The complex international situation and the need to tackle the problems facing humankind together underscore the importance of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.15, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the areas of disarmament and non-proliferation”. We believe that the draft resolution makes a major contribution to the debates and efforts aimed at finding effective and lasting multilateral solutions in the areas of disarmament and non-proliferation.

The legitimate concern of the international community with regard to the effects of the years of use of weapons and ammunition containing depleted uranium is addressed comprehensively in draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.19, which makes clear that there is a need for further research in order to ascertain the long-term health and environmental effects of the use of such weapons and munitions.

Cuba urges all delegations to support the draft resolutions introduced by the Non-Aligned Movement under this cluster. We trust that the overwhelming majority of delegations will vote in favour of them, as in previous years.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Trinidad and Tobago to introduce an oral correction to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.39/Rev.1.

Ms. Haynes (Trinidad and Tobago): I take the floor to make some general comments on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.39/Rev.1, entitled “Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control”.

At the outset, please allow me to make an oral correction to the text that the Committee has before it. The reference to the sixty-sixth session in paragraph 3 is incorrect; it should be to the sixty-seventh session, as our aim is to make the draft resolution a biennial one. The sentence should therefore read as follows:

“Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its sixty-seventh session an item entitled ‘Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control’.”

I wish to request that this correction be placed on the record and be reflected in the final version of the text.

With the introduction of this draft resolution, the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago and the sponsors of the text invited the First Committee to join in the achievement of a historic and noble objective by embracing a more holistic and dynamic view of matters related to international peace and security, specifically, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. It is our firmly held view that everyone has a role to play in efforts to achieve lasting international peace and security. In that regard, the role of women goes beyond the recognition of their status as victims, but must also include an acknowledgement of, and support for, their potential and actual contributions to the process. That is the principle that lies at the heart of the draft resolution.

Document A/C.1/65/L.39/Rev.1 began as a very ambitious preliminary draft and has come a long way to become the draft resolution we have today. We are pleased to note that the text is more streamlined and focused than previous versions. It has benefited from exhaustive consultations and the input of a broad cross-section of delegations.

We wish to thank the sponsors and all other interested delegations for their support and suggestions for improving the text. We believe that document A/C.1/65/L.39/Rev.1 represents the best result that could have been achieved in the light of the varied, and sometimes competing, concerns that were expressed in consultations. This afternoon, it is our hope that the draft resolution can be adopted by consensus.

The Chair: The Committee will now take decisions on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 6. Before doing so, I shall call upon those delegations that wish to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 6.

Mr. Danon (France) (*spoke in French*): I take the floor to explain France’s non-participation in the decision on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.13.

For many years, the international community has been keen to stress the importance of the relationship that exists between the issues of disarmament and development. My delegation also acknowledges that link, insofar as disarmament is conducive to a secure and stable environment, which is an essential prerequisite for the success of all reconstruction and development policies in areas of armed conflict. We are also attuned to problems relating to financing for development, as demonstrated by our initiatives in that regard over the past few years.

However, we still object to certain elements retained in this text despite our suggestions for modifications. We consider the notion of a symbiotic relationship between disarmament and development, referred to in the seventh preambular paragraph, to be debatable for several reasons. First, disarmament has an impact on development conditions; but the converse is less certain, as the conditions conducive to disarmament are not necessarily dependent upon development alone and result from other factors. Secondly, the notion in that same paragraph by which military expenditures divert resources from the funding of development needs seems simplistic to us. Indeed, disarmament is not without cost, which we must not neglect.

Lastly, with regard to investments on defence, when aimed at acquiring resources that will help promote stability and security, these improve States’ abilities to contribute to peacekeeping operations and to respond to natural disasters — with airborne and

maritime equipment, for example — thereby also contributing to a country's development.

These factors therefore mean that we cannot endorse the decision to be taken on this draft resolution. However, we do not wish to obstruct its adoption.

Mr. Aly (Egypt): I take the floor to explain Egypt's position on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control", which was introduced to the First Committee as an attempt by its sponsors to promote gender dimensions related to Security Council resolution 1325 (2000). While Egypt fully supports the resolution and its objectives, it is also fully aware that the resolution is purely a human rights resolution, rather than a disarmament one.

Egypt actively participates in all relevant work relating to the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000) in the context of the Security Council and the Third Committee, which are the competent bodies to deal with the implementation of the resolution. We therefore have serious procedural concerns with regard to the relevance of the issues presented in draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.39/Rev.1 vis-à-vis the competence of the First Committee.

While we remain of the firm view that draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.39/Rev.1 covers issues that neither relate to the mandate of the First Committee nor to its agenda, Egypt has decided not to request a recorded vote on the draft resolution. However, we still believe that this issue would most appropriately be dealt with in the Third Committee, as the competent body for addressing human rights and the empowerment of women.

Mr. Lint (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): Belgium will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.19, entitled "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium".

On 20 June 2009, the law of 11 May 2007 entered into force in Belgium. This general law prohibits the manufacture, repair, display for sale, sale, transfer or transport of this type of prohibited weapon, as well as the storing, holding or carrying thereof. It also classifies as prohibited weapons inert munitions and armoured plating containing depleted uranium or any other type of industrial uranium.

The adoption of that law was preceded by parliamentary hearings that heard presentations from scientific experts. Different points of view were expressed as to the danger posed to health and to the environment by the use of depleted uranium weapons. Belgium pays very close attention to any developments in the scientific analysis of the dangers related to the use of weapons systems containing depleted uranium, including studies undertaken on this issue at the international level.

Belgium thus became the first country in the world to have decreed such a prohibition, based on the principles of caution and prudence.

Belgium stands ready to provide clarifications to the United Nations with regard to the definitions, objectives and modalities of its law. Belgium also notes its readiness to lend our expertise and provide information based on our legislative experience, where necessary, at the request of interested States, and in particular those currently establishing legislation in this area.

Belgium hopes that the draft resolution to be adopted by the First Committee will contribute to a better understating at the international level of the potential effects of weapons and ammunitions containing depleted uranium, with a view to reaching a joint assessment on this matter in due time.

Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Cuba will not oppose the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.36, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures". However, we believe it is necessary to place on record the following points.

With regard to the tenth preambular paragraph, which welcomes 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, Cuba believes it is important to make a distinction with regard to the fourth Biennial Meeting, which took place in June. As explicitly indicated in paragraph 23 of the final report (A/CONF.192/BMS/2010/3) of the fourth Biennial Meeting, the arbitrary procedure followed in the adoption of the final report at the Meeting cannot "constitute a precedent for future meetings on the Programme of Action".

Cuba attaches the greatest importance to that statement. Indeed, it was the inclusion of that wording that made possible the adoption of the final report of the fourth Biennial Meeting, which, as we all know, could not be negotiated by delegations in a transparent and inclusive manner.

Furthermore, my delegation would like to highlight that paragraph 5 of the draft resolution could be interpreted as saying that the General Assembly has given a specific mandate to a Group of Interested States. The Group can continue its work on an entirely informal basis, but in no way should it interfere with or duplicate the intergovernmental consultation and negotiation processes taking place under the auspices of the United Nations.

Mr. Hosseini (Islamic Republic of Iran): I take the floor to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.49/Rev.1, entitled "Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities".

Since there exists licit as well as illicit trade and brokering in small arms and light weapons, Member States addressed both issues within the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons. While recognizing the legal trade and brokering in small arms and light weapons, Member States emphasized the need to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade and brokering in such weapons.

However, the notion of illicit brokering in weapons of mass destruction, which is wrongly reflected in this draft resolution, implies that there is a licit trade in weapons of mass destruction. Under major international conventions on weapons of mass destruction, the production, development, research, transfer and use of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons is prohibited. Their trade or brokering is undoubtedly illegal as well.

Accordingly, the only interpretation of certain paragraphs of the draft resolution could be that the transfer of such inhuman weapons from a possessor State to non-possessor States is legal. While, for instance, in the case of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons the transfer of nuclear weapons from a nuclear-weapon State to non-nuclear-weapon States is legally prohibited.

While we appreciate and share the views of the main sponsor of the draft resolution on the need to prevent and combat the illicit brokering in small arms and light weapons, as well as the importance of preventing terrorist groups from gaining access to weapons of mass destruction — which is a valid concern — the Committee has already dealt with these issues in other draft resolutions. Furthermore, we are of the view that, logically and methodologically, it is inappropriate to mix these two completely different concepts, since the field of small arms and light weapons is totally different from that of weapons of mass destruction.

Moreover, the draft resolution lacks the focused approach that the General Assembly has requested on many occasions. In its current form, its adoption may lead to an interpretation that is detrimental to the letter and spirit of major international conventions on weapons of mass destruction.

We have consulted with the sponsor of the draft resolution and constructively proposed some amendments in order to enable us to join the consensus on it, as we did the last time a similar draft resolution was presented. While we appreciate the efforts of the delegation of the Republic of Korea to consider those amendments, it could not, unfortunately, accommodate our major concerns. There still exist substantive problems with the draft resolution. For instance, although implicitly, the draft resolution recognizes non-transparent and exclusive export-control regimes, such as the Australia Group, that were not negotiated or agreed within the ambit of the United Nations and only serve the political objectives of certain States by hampering international cooperation.

For the reasons I have mentioned, my delegation will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

Ms. Kennedy (United States of America): The United States will not participate in the Committee's action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.13. We continue to believe that disarmament and development are two distinct issues. Indeed, it was for that reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. The United States therefore does not consider itself bound by the Conference's Final Document. I also note that I found many of the comments of our French colleague very pertinent in this regard.

I further note that the United States will not participate in the action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.14, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”. However, I would emphasize that my country operates under the most stringent domestic and international environmental impact regulations for all activities, including the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. However, we do not see a direct connection between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control, as stated in the draft resolution. We do not consider this matter germane to the First Committee.

Mrs. Ancidey (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would like to express its position with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.36, entitled “Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures”.

As part of Venezuela’s commitment to multilateral disarmament efforts as a means to contribute to strengthening international peace and security, we support and implement the measures set out in the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. In that connection, we reiterate the full relevance of multilateralism in addressing those issues and the importance of international cooperation and assistance in energizing joint efforts within the framework of the Programme of Action.

Moreover, we would like to express our understanding of paragraph 5. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela believes that this paragraph neither represents nor grants the group of interested States with a formal General Assembly mandate — nor can it be interpreted as doing so — to develop cooperation and assistance programmes in the context of the Programme of Action, given the group’s informal nature and the fact that it works outside the framework of the United Nations. Venezuela hopes that in addition to the practical measures towards disarmament being considered by the informal group of interested States, other disarmament measures in the context of nuclear disarmament will also be taken up for discussion in the future.

The Chair: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.13. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.13, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement earlier at today’s meeting. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.13. In addition, the United Republic of Tanzania has also become a sponsor.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.13 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.14. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.14, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement earlier at today’s meeting. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.14.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.14 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.15. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.15, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”, was introduced today by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of

the Non-Aligned Movement. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.15 and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.4.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), 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, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg,

Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.15 was adopted by 117 votes to 4, with 48 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.19. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.19, entitled "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium", was introduced today by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.19.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal,

Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.19 was adopted by 136 votes to 4, with 28 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.37. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee):

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.37, 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 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.37 and A/C.1/65/CRP.4.

With the permission of the Chairman, I shall now read out for the record an oral statement of the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.37. This statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-

General, with the assistance of the group of governmental experts to be established in 2012 on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, taking into account the assessments and recommendations of the report referred to in the draft resolution, 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 the study to the Assembly at its sixty-eighth session.

Pursuant to the request contained in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the group of governmental experts would hold three sessions, of a week's duration each, two in New York in 2012 and 2013 and one in Geneva in 2013. Specifically, for the first session, to be held in New York in 2012, interpretation services from and into the six official languages will be required for the 10 meetings, and it is envisaged that five documents, totalling 15,000 words, will have to be translated into the six official languages; for the second session, to be held in Geneva in 2013, interpretation services from and into the six official languages will be required for the 10 meetings and, in addition, six documents totalling 25,000 words will have to be translated into the six official languages; and for the third session, to be held in New York in 2013, interpretation services from and into the six official languages will be required for the 10 meetings and, in addition, one document of 10,700 words will have to be translated into the six official languages.

The total resources required to service the three sessions of the group of governmental experts in 2012-2013 are estimated to be \$945,100, including \$481,000 for meetings and documentation services under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management”; \$10,000 under section 28D, “Office of Central Support Services”; and \$4,000 under 28E, “Administration, Geneva”, for sound, technical and technical support costs during those meetings; as well as \$450,000 under section 4, “Disarmament”, for the travel costs of experts, the cost of consultants and the provision of substantive services to the proposed group of governmental experts.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.37, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget

for the biennium 2010-2011. The additional financial implications for the biennium 2012-2013 will be considered in the context of the finalization of the proposed programme budget for that biennium.

It should be noted that the holding of one session in Geneva would constitute an exception to section 1, paragraph 4, of resolution 40/243, by which the Assembly reaffirmed the general principle that in drawing up the schedule of conferences and meetings, United Nations bodies shall plan to meet at their respective headquarters, in this case New York.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.37 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.36. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 6. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.36, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 15th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.36 and A/C.1/65/CRP.4. With the permission of the Chair, I shall now read out for the record an oral statement of the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany the draft resolution.

This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Under the terms of paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.36, the Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs with adequate resources for maintaining the Programme of Action Implementation Support System as from 2012, thus securing its important role in identifying and communicating information on needs and resources so as to enhance the implementation of the Programme of Action.

It is envisaged that the existing extrabudgetary resources would be sufficient for maintaining the Programme of Action Implementation Support System through the biennium 2010-2011. Therefore, should the

Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.36, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011. Any possible additional financial implications for maintaining the Programme of Action Implementation Support System beyond 2011 will be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

I should also like to inform members that Uzbekistan has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

none

Abstaining:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Paragraph 6 was retained by 166 votes to 0, with 1 abstention.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.36 as a whole. The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to proceed accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.36, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.39/Rev.1. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.39/Rev.1, entitled “Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control”, was introduced by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago at the 15th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.39/Rev.1 and A/C.1/65/CRP.4. In addition, Hungary, New Zealand, Portugal and Suriname have also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The representative of Trinidad and Tobago has just introduced an oral correction, by which “sixty-sixth” would be replaced by “sixty-seventh” in paragraph 3.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.39/Rev.1, as orally corrected, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/65/L.40. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/65/L.40, entitled “Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament”, was introduced by the representative of India at the 16th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/65/L.40.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/65/L.40 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.49/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate recorded vote has been requested on the twelfth preambular paragraph. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.49/Rev.1, entitled “Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities”, was introduced by the representative of the Republic of Korea at the 21st meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.49/Rev.1 and A/C.1/65/CRP.4. In addition, Botswana and Nigeria have also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Syrian Arab Republic

The twelfth preambular paragraph was retained by 166 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.49/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.49/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 171 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.52. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.52, entitled “United Nations Disarmament Information Programme”, was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 16th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.52 and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.4. In addition, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Indonesia and Nigeria have also become sponsors.

I should like to inform the Committee that the delegation of Mexico has just introduced an oral revision by which paragraph 5 (c) would read as follows:

“To encourage the use of the Programme as a means to provide information related to progress on the implementation of nuclear disarmament measures”.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.52, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.53. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.53, entitled “United Nations study on disarmament and non-proliferation education”, was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 16th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.53 and A/C.1/65/CRP.4. Indonesia has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.53 was adopted.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to speak in explanation of

vote or position on the draft resolutions and decision just adopted.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): I take the floor to explain our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.19, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”. It is Germany’s understanding that paragraph 6 of the draft resolution does not set a precedent for similar cases.

Ms. Higgie (New Zealand): I take the floor on behalf of Australia, Canada and New Zealand to explain our abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.15, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”.

We are disappointed that once again we were unable to support the draft resolution. Our strong commitment to multilateral principles and approaches in the field of non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament is indisputable. We have consistently promoted the advantages of multilateral processes in achieving progress on international security issues. However, we cannot agree that multilateralism constitutes the sole principle in negotiations on disarmament and non-proliferation, as is implied in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution. In our view, effective progress on global non-proliferation and disarmament objectives requires a combination of multilateral, plurilateral, regional, bilateral and unilateral measures working to reinforce each another in order to achieve concrete results. The eighth preambular paragraph specifically recognizes the complementarity of such measures. We hope that, in the future, the operative paragraphs of this draft resolution will reflect that understanding.

In our view, the assertion that multilateralism provides the only sustainable method of addressing non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament issues disregards the potential of alternative measures, such as bilateral and regional ones, to address global security issues. The matters at stake are simply too vital. We cannot afford not to make use of all mechanisms available to us to improve the international security environment.

Those are the reasons that our three delegations have been unable to support the draft resolution. We therefore abstained in the voting.

Mr. Schaper (Netherlands): I have asked for the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.19. The Netherlands has again voted in favour of this draft resolution, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”.

We are not against ongoing research on this subject. We appreciate the fact that it is being discussed in the forum of the United Nations. However, we do feel that the basis for such research and discussion could have been formulated at this stage in a more neutral way, by speaking of possible consequences instead of potential hazards or potential harmful effects.

As we stated in our submission to the report of the Secretary-General (A/65/129), the reference in the draft resolution to the potential harmful effects of the use of depleted uranium munitions on human health and the environment cannot — to date — be supported by conclusive scientific evidence. According to the Secretary-General’s report, that is a view shared by the World Health Organization and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

We will closely monitor the outcome of ongoing and future research in this field and take any further developments into consideration when the issue is taken up again during the 2012 session of the First Committee.

Mr. García López-Trigo (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): We find it necessary to place on record the following positions with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.49/Rev.1, entitled “Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities”.

First, we have accepted the twelfth preambular paragraph and paragraph 2 with the understanding that they refer only to the application by States of the instruments and treaties to which they are parties and whose obligations have been accepted in a sovereign manner, pursuant to international law. In no way can those two paragraphs be construed as granting legitimacy to instruments that, in the opinion of Cuba, are not fully consistent with the Charter of the United Nations and international law, such as the so-called Proliferation Security Initiative.

Secondly, Cuba has supported the draft resolution with the understanding that its aim is to bolster, and in no way weaken, the multilateral and non-discriminatory

approach in the area of disarmament and arms control, as that is the only effective means of preventing and tackling the possible use of weapons of mass destruction by terrorists.

Thirdly, as is explicitly acknowledged in the draft resolution, we wish to emphasize that initiatives to prevent and combat illicit brokering activities cannot jeopardize international cooperation with respect to materials, equipment and technology used for peaceful purposes. The language of the draft resolution is far from perfect and can certainly be improved. We believe that the concerns that a number of delegations have expressed with regard to the text are legitimate and should duly be taken into account. In that regard, we appeal to sponsors to continue to work to improve the draft resolution, with a view to achieving consensus when the issue is once again considered by the Committee.

With regard to draft resolution [A/C.1/65/L.37](#), entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”, Cuba wholeheartedly shares the concerns expressed about the use of technologies and information media for purposes that are incompatible with international stability and security and negatively impair the integrity of States.

In that regard, my delegation is once again compelled, as it has done previously, to denounce the radio and television-borne aggression committed by the United States Government against Cuba for decades now. That aggression openly flouts the rules of international law and the rules and norms of the International Telecommunication Union. The United States Government is not repairing the damage it may be doing to international peace and security by creating dangerous situations such as using a military aircraft to send television signals to Cuba without our consent.

In recent years, radio and electronic emissions from United States territory have exceeded 2,300 hours per week, from various broadcasters and on various frequencies. Several of those radio broadcasters — which belong or provide their services to organizations linked to known terrorist elements who reside in, and act against Cuba from, United States territory — broadcast programmes calling for sabotage, political attacks and the assassination of prominent persons and dealing with other subjects typical of terrorist radio broadcasts.

The World Radiocommunication Conference in Geneva has repeatedly highlighted the illegality of such broadcasts to Cuba from military aircraft, stating that they are in contravention of radiocommunications regulations. Our country will continue to take all measures within its power to combat these unacceptable and illegal aggressive actions. We will also continue to denounce such aggression in every international forum where it is possible to do so.

Mr. Pollard (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.13, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”. We welcome the mainstreaming of disarmament issues in development policy. This is particularly important in the field of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration.

However, the United Kingdom does not believe that there is an automatic link between disarmament and development. Rather, a complex relationship exists between the two. Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.13 does not explain fully the complexity of that relationship. As we have previously explained, the United Kingdom considers that the report of the Group of Governmental Experts (see A/59/119) did not give sufficient credit to unilateral, bilateral and multilateral actions in disarmament and non-proliferation.

The United Kingdom also notes that, while it would be desirable to share information about resources made available for development through the implementation of disarmament and arms control agreements, in practice it is not possible to identify a direct relationship between different sources of funding. We will, however, continue to make available information on our increasing levels of development assistance through relevant forums.

I would now like to deliver the following joint explanation of position on behalf of the United Kingdom and France, which both joined consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.14, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”.

We wish to make it clear that the United Kingdom and France operate under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. We see no direct connection,

as stated in the draft resolution, between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control.

Mr. Toro (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.37, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”. However, owing to recent developments on this subject in multilateral forums and with a view to striking a better balance in dealing with this subject, our delegation would like to go more into depth on some relevant issues that relate to this topic.

We would like to underscore that joint United Nations efforts to prevent developments in information and telecommunications from being used for purposes that are contrary to the maintenance of international peace and security should not undermine the principles of universal and non-discriminatory access for all States to such technologies, as reflected in the Declaration of Principles of the World Summit on the Information Society.

We would also like to highlight that international peace and security can be negatively impacted not just by the action of non-State groups and actors but also by the aggression perpetrated by a State against the information and telecommunications networks of other States through the implementation of hostile policies. For instance, among other acts with negative consequences for international law and the peaceful coexistence of States, it is important to consider possible aggression against national networks through the use of foreign computer programmes, or even internal sources of the State concerned itself, that are conceived and promoted from abroad; as well as radio or television broadcasts that are designed to promote social disorder or to disrupt the constitutional order of a targeted State.

Mr. Hosseini (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.36, entitled “Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures”.

In some of its operative paragraphs, this draft resolution unnecessarily provides the ground for activities parallel to the established follow-up and implementation mechanism of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons.

By requesting the Secretary-General to provide resources for maintaining the Programme of Action Implementation Support System, a unit established outside the Organization and funded voluntarily by some States, the draft resolution imposes an additional financial burden on the United Nations. Decisions to create any possible mechanism for extending financial or other kind of resources or assistance with regard to the follow-up and implementation of the Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons should be taken by the Review Conference to be held in 2012. In our view, not only are those measures not helpful in the implementation of the Programme of Action, they will also lead to further bureaucracy within the Organization, which is already complicated.

For those reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting on paragraph 6 of the draft resolution.

Mr. Rao (India): I have asked for the floor to explain India's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control".

My delegation commends Trinidad and Tobago, the lead sponsor, for introducing this draft resolution, which focuses attention on an important dimension of global disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation efforts, namely, the recognition that the participation of both men and women is essential for the attainment of sustainable peace and security. Greater involvement by women in the field of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control should be supported and strengthened. India has therefore extended its full support for the draft resolution.

Mr. Danon (France) (*spoke in French*): I should like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.19 on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States. Our three countries voted against the draft resolution, entitled "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium".

This is not a new issue. Despite some updates, the draft resolution continues to call for further action by the Secretary-General and by Member States, based on the alleged harmful effects of the use of depleted uranium munitions on human health and the environment. It refers to the relevant studies done so far by international organizations on the subject, but it does not seem to give those studies credit in terms of long-term relevance and still presupposes, in its sixth preambular paragraph,

"the magnitude of the potential long-term effects on human beings and the environment".

The environmental and long-term health effects of the use of depleted uranium munitions have been so far thoroughly investigated by the World Health Organization, the United Nations Environmental Programme, the International Atomic Energy Agency, NATO, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the European Commission and others. None of these investigations has documented any cases of long-term environmental or health effects attributable to the use of such munitions. It is regrettable that the conclusions of these studies have been ignored in this way.

Furthermore, paragraph 6 of the draft resolution asks Member States that have used depleted uranium in armed conflict to provide information about that use. We have serious doubts about the relevance of such a request in the context of international humanitarian law. We believe that it is up to each Member State to provide this data at such a time and in such a way as it deems appropriate.

The Chair: The Committee has thus concluded action on cluster 6. We shall now move on to the draft resolutions listed under cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 7, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions.

Ms. Chaimongkol (Thailand): On behalf of the informal group of observer states to the Conference on Disarmament, I have the honour to make the following general statement with regard to two draft resolutions.

First, on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34, entitled "Follow-up to the high-level meeting held on 24 September 2010: revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations", the informal group expressed, in a joint statement during the high-level meeting, its sincere expectation that the meeting would reinvigorate the essential political will required to launch the revitalization of the work of the Conference. We also expressed the hope that the high-level meeting would lead to concrete follow-up action. For that reason, we support Austria's initiative on the draft resolution and hope it will help to mobilize the

much-needed political will to move the Conference forward.

In general, we believe that the General Assembly has a strong drive towards supporting the work of the Conference on Disarmament. The proposal to include the item on revitalizing the work of the Conference on the provisional agenda of the Assembly's sixty-sixth session is a concrete step forward. At the same time, we wish to stress that any follow-up action by the Assembly should aim to strengthen the Conference and maintain its integrity as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum.

I now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.57, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". The informal group of observer States to the Conference takes this opportunity to express its appreciation to Cameroon for preparing the draft resolution. We wish to reiterate that the principle around which the observer States to the Conference formed the informal group, earlier this year, was to enhance our engagement with the Conference. It is a shared aspiration of the Group that transparency and inclusiveness be strongly promoted within the Conference. We have indeed appreciated the willingness to engage us that the Presidents of the Conference have shown the group over the past year.

In that regard, we are pleased that the letter from the group to the President of the Conference on Disarmament regarding our activities was reflected as an official Conference document, as well as in paragraph 24 of the report contained in document A/65/27, which is referred to in the draft resolution. Although we were disappointed that our activities during the past year were not reflected more clearly, in the spirit of cooperation we considered it best that we support the report of the Conference as it stands.

At the same time, the group welcomes the repeated calls during the high-level meeting that many States, both members and observers of the Conference, made on the Conference on Disarmament to seriously consider the issue of expansion. In the Group's joint statement at the high-level meeting, also delivered by Thailand, we urged Conference members to consider seriously appointing a special coordinator on expansion of the membership when the Conference resumes its session in 2011. We wish to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for reflecting this view in his summary of the high-level meeting,

although we regret that our call was not endorsed in the draft resolution before us. Nevertheless, once again in the spirit of cooperation, we will support the draft resolution.

The informal group of observer States to the Conference on Disarmament reiterates its call for continuing discussion of the issue of membership of the Conference. We remain hopeful that the Conference will appoint a special coordinator on the expansion of the Conference when it resumes its work in 2011. It will certainly provide a starting point for serious consideration of the issue of expansion.

Mr. Conlon (Austria): Austria introduced draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.34, entitled "Follow-up to the high-level meeting held on 24 September 2010: revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations", during discussions on the "Disarmament machinery" cluster on 18 October.

Following consultations with delegations that approached us following the introduction of the original draft — and as the representative of Thailand has just spoken, I thank her also for approaching us after the introduction — the sponsors of the draft resolution decided to produce a revised text, which was issued on Friday, 22 October, and includes changes to paragraphs 3 and 4 that were designed to address questions raised with the authors. In paragraph 3, the new text recognizes that suggestions were made both by Member States and by the Secretary-General at the high-level meeting. In paragraph 4, the sponsors took account of views conveyed to them that the agenda item at the sixty-sixth session, next year, should focus on the substance of the matters in question and not on a single meeting. The sponsors accepted the logic of that approach.

We wish to express our sincere appreciation to delegations for their constructive feedback and cooperation. We believe that it should now be possible to adopt the draft resolution without a vote, setting the scene for our collective work in the year ahead. We thank all of the original sponsors and the many new sponsors that have since come on board from across all regions, and commend this text to the First Committee.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Nigeria to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.55/Rev.1.

Mr. Obisakin (Nigeria): Nigeria is taking the floor to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.55/Rev.1, entitled “United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services”. This fellowship, as most members are aware, was first introduced by Nigeria 32 years ago. Nigeria wants to thank those who have sponsored it and hopes that there will be more sponsors for the fellowship.

We want to also note that, in an effort to promote gender mainstreaming, the United Nations has selected 22 women to participate in the fellowship. The modern dog can catch the modern thieves. The fellowship is where our successors are being trained. We want to appeal to all Members to sponsor the draft resolution as a reflection of the importance of this training mechanism. We also want to appeal to all members to adopt the draft resolution by the usual consensus. Working together only confers more honour.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.58.

Mr. Ikongo Isekotoko Boyoo (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*spoke in French*): On behalf of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, I would like to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.58, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”.

This draft resolution was initiated by the Democratic Republic of the Congo and has traditionally been submitted on behalf of the countries on the Committee and Rwanda. The Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has suggested that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus. That is the position of the

Democratic Republic of the Congo and the countries of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Indonesia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.16.

Mr. Percaya (Indonesia): On behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), I am privileged to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.16, entitled “United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament”.

NAM encourages United Nations activities at the regional level to advance disarmament and increase the stability and security of Member States. In that regard, the maintenance and strengthening of the regional centres for peace and disarmament are very important.

To achieve this positive result, the regional centres should carry out innovative dissemination and educational programmes on promoting regional peace and security by aiming to influence the basic attitudes of people on the issues of peace, security and disarmament. Persistent and effective work on sensitizing and mobilizing public opinion can contribute significantly to creating a conducive climate for Governments, in particular those of nuclear-weapon States, to expedite the implementation of their obligations on disarmament and non-proliferation.

The Movement hopes that Member States, along with civil society and non-governmental organizations, will enhance their efforts to support the United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament. We also hope that the draft resolution will enjoy the appropriate support from all Member States.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.