



General Assembly

Sixty-sixth session

First Committee

22nd meeting

Thursday, 27 October 2011, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Viinanen (Finland)

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

Agenda items 87 to 106 (continued)

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

The Chair: This afternoon, the First Committee will continue to take action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under agenda items 87 to 106. We will begin by taking up the remaining draft resolutions and decisions contained in the first revision to informal paper 1, in particular under cluster 6, “Other disarmament measures and international security”, and cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”. Thereafter, the Committee will turn to the other clusters contained in the first revision of informal paper 2, which has now been distributed, pending the issuance of a second revision of informal paper 2.

Our deliberations today and for the rest of the action phase of our work will be guided by the same procedure we observed yesterday. Delegations will have an opportunity to make general statements under each cluster and to explain their positions before and after voting.

The Committee will now take up cluster 6, “Other disarmament measures and international security”, as contained in the first revision of informal paper 1. I shall first give the floor to representatives who wish to introduce draft resolutions or to make general statements, other than explanations of vote, on matters related to cluster 6.

Mrs. Balaguer Labrada (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation’s statement concerns cluster 6, “Other disarmament measures and international security”.

Cuba aligns itself with the Non-Aligned Movement in connection with the draft resolutions to be introduced today on behalf of the Movement under this cluster. We wish to underscore that, as in previous years, the members of the Non-Aligned Movement have submitted three draft resolutions that address important issues that are of great relevance not only for those countries that are members of the Movement but for the international community as a whole, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.6, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”; draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.7, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”; and draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.8, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”.

Disarmament and development are two of the main challenges that humankind must face, all the more so given the profound effects of the economic, social, food, energy and environmental crises upon us. In that regard, Cuba reiterates its proposal to establish a fund under the aegis of the United Nations that would receive at least half of the amount of military expenditure currently being made, in order to meet economic, social and development needs of the countries that require 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.



Cuba also believes that international disarmament forums should take fully into account relevant environmental norms when negotiating treaties and arrangements in the areas of disarmament and arms control, as reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.7.

The complex international situation and the need to tackle in unison the various problems that affect humankind underscore the significance of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.8, on multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. We believe that this draft resolution makes an important contribution to the debates and to the quest for effective lasting multilateral solutions in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation.

Cuba urges all delegations to support the draft resolutions that have been submitted under this cluster and looks forward to seeing the overwhelming majority of States here vote in favour of them, as has been the case in previous years.

The Chair: We shall now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions and decisions submitted under cluster 6, “Other disarmament measures and international security”, namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/66/L.6, A/C.1/66/L.7, A/C.1/66/L.8 and A/C.1/66/L.33 and draft decisions A/C.1/66/L.12 and A/C.1/66/L.44.

I give the floor to the representative of the United States, who wishes to speak in explanation of position.

Ms. Kennedy (United States of America): The United States will not participate in the Committee’s action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.6, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”. Our delegation believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues. Accordingly, we do not consider ourselves bound by the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which was adopted on 11 September 1987.

The United States will also not participate in the Committee’s action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.7. I would note that the United States operates under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many 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.

The Chair: We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.6, “Relationship between disarmament and development”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.6, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the Committee’s 17th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.6 and CRP.3/Rev.2.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.6 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.7. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.7, 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 Non-Aligned Movement at the Committee’s 17th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.7 and CRP.3/Rev.2.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.7 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.8. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.8, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the Committee’s 17th meeting, on 20 October. The

sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.8 and CRP.3/Rev.2.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, 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, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, 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, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, 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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.8 was adopted by 120 votes to 4, with 49 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/66/L.12. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/66/L.12, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.12.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/66/L.12 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.33. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.33, entitled "National legislation on transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology", was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/66/L.33.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.33 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/66/L.44. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/66/L.44, entitled “Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament”, was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee’s 17th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/66/L.44.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/66/L.44 was adopted.

The Chair: We have now taken action on all the draft resolutions and decisions under cluster 6 contained in informal paper 1. I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions.

Mr. Danon (France) (*spoke in French*): On behalf of the United Kingdom and France, I should like to speak in explanation of position with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.6, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”.

The United Kingdom and France joined the consensus on this draft resolution. We support the integration of issues related to disarmament in development policy, in particular with regard to conventional weapons and small and light weapons, as well as with respect to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. Nonetheless, we consider it necessary to clarify our position on other aspects of the text.

The notion of a symbiotic relationship between disarmament and development strikes us as questionable, insofar as the conditions favourable to disarmament do not necessarily depend solely on development, as we can see with the growth of military expenditure on the part of those countries developing most rapidly. There is no automatic link there, but rather a complex relationship that such a notion does not reflect with precision. Furthermore, the idea according to which military expenditures deter the needs of development and its financial requirements ought to be refined. Investments in defence capabilities are also necessary for peacekeeping and to improve rapid response in case of natural disasters, for example through air and maritime service and, under certain conditions, for enhancing stability.

Lastly, we believe that the report of the Group of Governmental Experts (see A/59/119) did not give sufficient importance to unilateral, bilateral and multilateral actions in the field of disarmament.

I would also like to provide an explanation of position on behalf of the United Kingdom and France with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.7, “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”.

We would like to clearly indicate that the United Kingdom and France act in full compliance with their domestic legislation in effect in various areas when it comes to the implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control. We do not see any direct link, in contrast to what is indicated in this draft resolution, between the general rules that are enforced regarding environmental protection and arms control agreements.

Ms. Golberg (Canada): I take the floor on behalf of Australia, Canada and New Zealand to explain our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.8, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”. We are disappointed that, once again, we are unable to support this 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 advocated for the benefit 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 one 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 likewise 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 measures, to address global security challenges. The matters at stake are simply too vital. We cannot afford not to make use of all the measures available to us to improve the international security environment.

Those are the reasons for which we have been unable to support the draft resolution and have instead abstained in the voting on it.

The Chair: We will now proceed with cluster 7, entitled “Disarmament machinery”, as set forth in the first revision of informal paper 1. We will begin by hearing from delegations that wish either to make general statements, other than explanations of position, on any of the draft resolutions in that cluster, or to introduce draft resolutions.

Mrs. Balaguer Labrada (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Cuba wishes to make a general statement.

In the context of the adoption of the draft resolutions corresponding to the cluster dealing with disarmament machinery, Cuba, in its capacity as the most recent President of the Conference on Disarmament, and consequently as sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.13/Rev.1, concerning the report of the Conference on Disarmament, would like to reaffirm the importance of the Conference on Disarmament as the only multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament. The consultations that have taken place in the context of the negotiation on this draft resolution underscore the need for the Conference on Disarmament to adopt as soon as possible a programme of work that is broad, well balanced and duly takes into account the real priorities in the field of disarmament.

The Conference on Disarmament is prepared to negotiate in parallel a treaty that will prohibit and eliminate nuclear weapons, a treaty which will prohibit an arms race in outer space, a treaty that will provide effective security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States, and a treaty to prohibit the manufacture of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other explosive devices.

Nuclear disarmament should continue to be the highest priority. It must be used as a basis to forge consensus within the context of the Conference on Disarmament, an organ which has, as we all know, been affected by the lack of political will demonstrated by a number of Member States, preventing it from

making real, tangible progress in the field of disarmament.

The compromise formula that is reflected in the language of the draft resolution to be adopted today sends a clear message in support of the resumption of the substantive work of the Conference on Disarmament.

As in previous sessions, Cuba will support draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.20, entitled “Report of the Disarmament Commission”. We underscore the importance of the Commission as the only specialized deliberative organ of the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery.

With regard to the language in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, Cuba hopes that it will be possible to reach consensus on the issues that are on the Commission’s agenda for upcoming sessions. At the same time, we hope that all Member States will demonstrate the necessary political resolve and due flexibility in order to reach agreements regarding specific arrangements to be submitted to the General Assembly.

Mr. Lagos (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): On this occasion, my delegation would like to make a general statement on the items under cluster 7.

Chile, a country that is committed to peace and the principles of international law, reiterates its conviction and desire to promote general and complete disarmament. That is not only consistent with our foreign policy and with our participation in regional and global forums, but it is also in line with the responsibility we bear as a member of the international community to participate and to contribute to an international regime for disarmament and non-proliferation.

In the debates that have taken place within the First Committee, we have noted the concern for the stalemate that exists in the work of the Conference on Disarmament, and in particular with respect to the lack of progress achieved in the field of nuclear disarmament. Chile shares that concern, but remains of the view that the Conference on Disarmament must remain the principal multilateral disarmament forum. Nevertheless, its current inability to reach agreement on a programme of work and to make progress on pending urgent matters should lead us to reflect on the necessary reforms that could contribute to easing the

impasse in the work of the Conference on Disarmament and help revitalize the disarmament machinery. Chile therefore supports initiatives that will help create new impetus that contributes to overcoming the existing deadlock while also strengthening the Conference on Disarmament.

We remain convinced that the responsibility regarding threats to peace and security must be shared by all Member States. We remain of the view that multilateralism is a fundamental mechanism for ensuring the adoption and universalization of norms that protect States and their citizens from such threats. In that context, we welcome proposals that are aimed at addressing the priority matters of the Conference on Disarmament, such as nuclear disarmament, negative security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States, the negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty and the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

On the one hand, there is still concern over the lack of progress in the field of nuclear disarmament and over the associated risks of nuclear proliferation. On the other hand, however, we have seen that there is a growing awareness in the international community that is made evident through positive signs such as, for example, the progress that has been achieved in strengthening the legal framework concerning nuclear-weapon-free zones and in the establishment of United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament.

Chile believes that we should take advantage of this moment of growing global concern on the issue of disarmament in order to advance in the process of universalizing the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and ensure its entry into force. The same holds true for the matter of transparency and for moving ahead on specific measures pursuant to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and on the commitments made during its Review Conferences.

In that context, we believe that this juncture should motivate us to confirm the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We will continue to support initiatives and resolutions that contribute to bringing us closer to our final goal, which is to achieve a world free of threats to the peace and security of nations and their citizens.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The thematic discussions and the upcoming vote on the draft resolutions submitted under cluster 7,

entitled “Disarmament machinery” demonstrate that we have now reached a crossroads. We will either reach a compromise and begin pragmatic work on the most pressing matters pertaining to multilateral disarmament or we will face the threat of the collapse or complete paralysis of the entire United Nations disarmament machinery. The traditional procedural decisions, such as on the reports of the Conference on Disarmament and the United Nations Disarmament Commission, are scarcely satisfactory at all, since they essentially point to the lack of actual results within those forums. Such a status quo is absolutely unacceptable.

With a view to rectifying that situation during this session, the Russian delegation unofficially distributed a proposal that we felt could have served as a basis for beginning substantive negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament (CD). Within the framework of a balanced programme of work, we proposed to begin work on elaborating the main elements of a fissile material cut-off treaty and on continuing substantive discussions on three other key issues, namely, nuclear disarmament, negative security assurances and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Agreement on a programme of work for the CD, apart from taking the forum out of its long deadlock, could also become an effective alternative to radical approaches to the reform of the United Nations disarmament mechanism, which are creating even greater divisiveness among us.

We are grateful for the broad-based support for our approach. We regret that, due to various circumstances during this session of the First Committee, we missed an opportunity to come to an agreement. However, the Russian delegation calls upon all States, above all the member States of the Conference on Disarmament, to continue to seek a compromise that would enable us in 2012 to begin concrete work on priority issues on the multilateral disarmament agenda.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.13, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”, which was introduced by the representative of Cuba, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea joined as a sponsor of the draft resolution, in the belief that it reflected the progress of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in a balanced and comprehensive manner. In particular, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea would like to underscore the one

essential point contained in paragraph 1, that is, the reaffirmation of the Conference on Disarmament as a unique multilateral forum in the international community. As one of the CD's six Presidents during the 2011 session, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has worked closely with the other five Presidents to make progress on the four core issues. As part of that process, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has confirmed that there is a strong need for political will to make progress in the CD.

The Chair: We will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/66/L.9, A/C.1/66/L.13/Rev.1 and A/C.1/66/L.20.

I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan, who wishes to speak in explanation of position before action is taken on the draft resolutions.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I have taken the floor to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.13/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

My delegation wishes to express special appreciation for the professional manner in which the delegations of Cuba and China carried out the work on this draft resolution, carefully crafting the elements of the text before us. We also acknowledge the constructive spirit with which delegations participated in the informal consultations in Geneva and New York. As a result of those efforts, the current text is a significant improvement from last year in that it seeks to present a factual report.

In large measure, unlike last year's divisive approach, the current draft resolution serves to move us all towards consensus. It was in that spirit that Pakistan and other delegations made a constructive proposal with regard to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. However, due to the intransigence of some delegations, our proposal was not incorporated.

As is well known, the Conference on Disarmament (CD) works on the basis of its rules of procedure, which provide for the adoption of a programme of work before the commencement of its work every year. Selective reference to any particular programme of work or a document of the CD neither adds any value nor facilitates consensus. In line with our strong commitment to the CD, we will join the consensus in favour of the draft resolution's adoption.

That is also a reflection of our support for the fact that the draft resolution was presented by Cuba and China.

However, my delegation is not in a position to associate itself with the following phrase in paragraph 2 of document A/C.1/66/L.13/Rev.1: "the decision on the programme of work adopted by the Conference on Disarmament on 29 May 2009".

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.9.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.9, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 25 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.9 and CRP.3/Rev.3.

With the permission of the Chair, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.9. This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.9, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide all necessary support within existing resources to the regional centres in carrying out their programmes and activities.

The implementation of the request would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, "Disarmament", of the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. The provisions contained therein cover the three P-5 posts of the directors of the regional centres for peace and disarmament, three P-3 posts of political affairs officers, and four General Service posts, local level, of administrative assistants of the regional centres, and also include general operating expenses for the three regional centres. The programmes of activity of the three regional centres would continue to be financed from extra-budgetary resources.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.9, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

The Committee's attention is also drawn to the provision of section VI of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 65/259, of 24 December 2010, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibility for administrative and budgetary matters, and also reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.9 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.13/Rev.1. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.13/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Cuba. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.13/Rev.1.

With the permission of the Chair, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.13/Rev.1. This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.13/Rev.1, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to ensure and strengthen, if needed, the provision to the Conference on Disarmament of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services. It is recalled that resources for the substantive and secretariat support of the Conference on Disarmament are included under section 4, "Disarmament", and for conference services under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

Subject to decisions taken at the 2012 session of the Conference on Disarmament to establish its programme of work for 2012 and to establish any subsidiary bodies for its implementation, the strengthening of all necessary administrative,

substantive and conference support services to the Conference, as requested in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, may entail additional resource requirements under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. The established procedures of the operation of a statement of programme budget implications would be followed, as necessary, in the context of actions taken by the Conference on Disarmament.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.13/Rev.1 would not give rise to any programme budget implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 at this time.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.13/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.20. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.20, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission", was introduced by the representative of Iraq on behalf of the members of the extended Bureau of the Disarmament Commission at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.20.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.20 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee has thus concluded action on the draft resolutions submitted under cluster 7 as contained in informal paper 1. I shall now call on delegations that wish to make statements in explanation of position on the draft resolutions just adopted under this cluster.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation joined the consensus on the draft resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament (CD), contained in document A/C.1/66/L.13/Rev.1. We would like to express our appreciation to the sponsors of the

draft resolution for their constructive approach, and to state the following.

We have always supported the reactivation of the CD based on a balanced and comprehensive programme of work and on full observance of its rules of procedure. The CD should be responsive to the priorities and security concerns of all States. We do not share the view that the decision in 2009 produced a balanced and comprehensive programme of work, although we joined the consensus in acceding to it that year for the sake of showing flexibility. In our view, the existence of nuclear weapons is the greatest threat to the security of all nations. Accordingly, the CD should consider negotiations on nuclear disarmament to be its highest priority.

Mr. Woolcott (Australia): Australia joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.13/Rev.1, but expresses regret that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution did not fully reflect the range of views expressed by ministers for foreign affairs in the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in 2011. As paragraph 7 of the CD's 2011 annual report (CD/1926) noted, ministers expressed support for the CD as well as concern about its current situation. This includes Australia's Minister for Foreign Affairs, on 1 March 2011.

Mr. Amano (Japan): Japan participated in the adoption without a vote of the draft resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament (A/C.1/66/L.13/Rev.1). It is disappointing, however, that the reference to the document on the programme of work (CD/1864) in this year's resolution was changed to an indirect one, and that the text relating to the recognition that the programme of work contained in document CD/1864 is balanced and comprehensive was deleted. Japan nevertheless accepted the current text as the result of the great flexibility demonstrated by the relevant Member States.

The Chair: The Committee has thus concluded our consideration of the draft resolutions under cluster 7, contained in the first revision to informal paper 1.

We shall now proceed to consider the draft resolutions under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons", contained in the first revision to informal paper 2.

Before we take a decision on the draft resolutions under cluster 1, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to make general statements or introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. Maung Wai (Myanmar): I have the honour to introduce, under cluster 1, the draft resolution entitled "Nuclear disarmament" (A/C.1/66/L.49), on behalf of the sponsors of the draft.

Nuclear weapons pose the greatest threat to the existence of mankind. To save our world from that grave danger, we need to act step by step and take measures leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons and an absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of such weapons.

The International Court of Justice, on 8 July 1996, issued an advisory opinion on the *Legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons* (see A/51/218), unanimously expressing that there exists an obligation for all States to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.

It is in that context that I am introducing the Committee's traditional annual draft resolution on nuclear disarmament once again this year.

The draft resolution recalls the statement on the total elimination of nuclear weapons adopted by the sixteenth Ministerial Conference and Commemorative Meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The draft also welcomes the ongoing efforts between the States members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the nuclear-weapon States, and encourages the nuclear-weapon States in their early signing of the Protocol to the Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone.

I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the eleventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49. The word "signing" should be replaced by the phrase "entry into force", so as to reflect that reality. The paragraph as a whole will now read:

"Taking note of the entry into force of the new strategic arms reduction treaty between the Russian Federation and the United States of America, in order to achieve further deep cuts in their strategic and tactical nuclear weapons, and stressing that such cuts should be irreversible, verifiable and transparent".

The draft resolution also calls upon the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament

leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified framework of time.

The draft resolution again calls on nuclear-weapon States, pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, to provide to non-nuclear-weapon States security assurances of non-use and non-threat of use of nuclear weapons through a legally binding instrument. The legitimate right of non-nuclear-weapon States that have given up their nuclear option is to be reciprocated by nuclear-weapon States with a legally binding instrument on security assurances of non-use and non-threat of use of nuclear weapons against them.

The draft resolution enjoys the overwhelming support of Member States. We would like to invite all Member States to join our efforts to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world by supporting our draft resolution on nuclear disarmament, as orally revised.

Ms. Kotyk (Tuvalu): Tuvalu had intended to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.40/Rev.1, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”. I request that this statement be reflected in the official records of the First Committee.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/66/L.42, L.49, L.51 and L.53.

I now give the floor to those representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position before the voting.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): Pakistan has consistently supported the goals of nuclear disarmament as well as the total elimination of nuclear weapons. My delegation is in agreement with several elements contained in draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49, including the call for the establishment by the Conference on Disarmament of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament; the conclusion of a legally binding instrument on negative security assurances; and the need to take into account the security interests of all States in the negotiation of disarmament treaties.

We note, however, that the draft contains unnecessary references to the full implementation of the action plan set out in the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)). In line with our well-known position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we shall abstain on paragraph 14.

With regard to paragraph 16, it calls for the immediate commencement of negotiations for a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT). It is indeed ironic that a draft resolution on nuclear disarmament chooses to reflect the non-proliferation, and not disarmament-centric, aspect, which is the FMCT. That anomaly notwithstanding, Pakistan, in line with its clear and unambiguous position on the FMCT, has decided to vote against that paragraph and to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Adejola (Nigeria): My delegation takes the floor on behalf of the African Group to introduce an oral revision to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.53, entitled “Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes”.

The ninth preambular paragraph should read as follows:

“Welcoming also the convening by the International Atomic Energy Agency of the Ministerial Conference on Nuclear Safety, held in Vienna from 20 to 24 June 2011, and its outcome, the ministerial declaration, as well as the Action Plan on Nuclear Safety endorsed by the General Conference of the Agency at its fifty-fifth regular session”.

A new, tenth, preambular paragraph should read as follows:

“Notes the convening by the Secretary-General of the High-level Meeting on Nuclear Safety and Security in New York on 22 September 2011”.

We hope that, with that oral revision, draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.53 will be adopted without a vote, as has been the case in the past.

The Chair: The Assembly will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.42. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.42, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons*”, was introduced by the representative of Malaysia. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.42 and CRP.3/Rev.3.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, 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, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Georgia, Iceland, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Montenegro, Norway, Republic of Korea, Republic of

Moldova, Romania, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.42 was adopted by 127 votes to 25, with 22 abstentions.

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

The Chair: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Myanmar. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.49 and CRP.3/Rev.3.

The Chair: Separate recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 14 and 16 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49. I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 14.

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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru,

Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Czech Republic, France, India, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Pakistan, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan

Operative paragraph 14 was retained by 157 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 16.

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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan,

Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, 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, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Pakistan

Abstaining:

France, Israel, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uzbekistan

Operative paragraph 16 was retained by 164 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's

Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Austria, Belarus, India, Ireland, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, New Zealand, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Serbia, Sweden, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49 was adopted by 113 votes to 44, with 18 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.51. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.51, entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty", was submitted by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the African Group at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 14 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.51 and CRP.3.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.51 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.53. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.53, entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the African Group at the Committee's 22nd meeting, on 27 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.53 and CRP.3/Rev.1.

The representative of Nigeria has just introduced an oral revision to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.53. Accordingly, the ninth preambular paragraph should read as follows:

"Welcoming also the convening by the International Atomic Energy Agency of the Ministerial Conference on Nuclear Safety, held in Vienna from 20 to 24 June 2011, and its outcome, the ministerial declaration, as well as the Action Plan on Nuclear Safety endorsed by the General Conference of the Agency at its fifty-fifth regular session".

A new, tenth, preambular paragraph should read as follows:

"Notes the convening by the Secretary-General of the High-level Meeting on Nuclear Safety and Security in New York on 22 September 2011".

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.53, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair: We have thus concluded action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 1 in the first revision of informal paper 2. I shall now give the floor to speakers who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position following the adoption of the drafts under this cluster.

Mr. Amano (Japan): I would like to make an explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/66/L.42 and A/C.1/66/L.49. I should first like to explain Japan's position on the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/66/L.42, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the international Court of Justice on the *Legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons*".

We highly appreciate Malaysia's sincere efforts and firm commitment to the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament, which led to the proposing of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.42. Japan also believes that because of their immense power to cause destruction, death and injury to human beings, the use of nuclear weapons is clearly contrary to the fundamental humanitarianism that provides the philosophical foundation of international law. Therefore, we would like to stress that nuclear weapons should never again be used, and continuous efforts should be made towards achieving a world free of nuclear weapons.

At the same time, we note that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, which the draft resolution addresses, clearly demonstrates the complexity of the subject. Japan supports the unanimous opinion of the judges of the International Court of Justice on the existing obligations under international law to pursue nuclear disarmament and to conclude negotiations on the matter in good faith. For that, we must take concrete measures to achieve steady, step-by-by progress in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. We believe that such progress should be made prior to embarking upon the negotiations that paragraph 2 of resolution A/C.1/66/L.42 calls upon all States to commence. That is the reason for Japan's abstention on this draft resolution.

Let me now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". Japan shares the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, which is the main focus of this draft resolution. However, we attach the highest priority to concerted actions by the international community,

including nuclear-weapon States, in order to steadily implement concrete measures towards nuclear disarmament. There continues to be a great difference between Japan's standpoint and the approach of this draft resolution. Therefore, as we did last year, Japan abstained from the voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. Lindell (Sweden): My delegation wishes to make a few short remarks in order to clarify its position on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.42, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons*". Sweden voted in favour of the draft resolution, as it has done in the past. We would, however, like to make a comment with regard to the fifteenth preambular paragraph, in which the General Assembly takes note of the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention. Sweden believes that this is done without prejudice to any future negotiating process on a nuclear-weapons convention or on a framework of separate, mutually reinforcing instruments.

Ms. Adamson (United Kingdom): I take the floor on behalf of the United Kingdom and the delegation of France to explain our votes on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". The United Kingdom and France voted against the draft resolution as a whole, but I would like to comment on paragraph 16, which calls for the immediate commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices on the basis of the report of the Special Coordinator and the mandate contained therein.

In accordance with the standing practice of my delegation and that of France, where we vote against a draft resolution as a whole, we refrain from voting on individual paragraphs. I therefore wish to reiterate the support of the United Kingdom and France for the objective of that paragraph, but to explain that this is the reason that we abstained on the paragraph.

I would also like to commend the language in paragraph 4, which refers to ongoing efforts between the States members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the nuclear-weapon States to conclude agreement on the signing of a protocol to the Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone. On behalf of my delegation and those of France

and the United States, we are indeed encouraged and encouraging ourselves to make early progress on that.

Mr. Singh Gill (India): I take the floor in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49, entitled “Nuclear disarmament”, and on explanation of position on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.51, entitled “African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty”.

On draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49, India attaches the highest priority to nuclear disarmament. India shares the main objective of the draft resolution, which is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified period of time. We have been constrained to abstain on the draft resolution because of certain references to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, on which India’s position is well known. However, our vote should not be seen as opposition to other provisions of the draft resolution, which we believe are consistent with the positions of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and with India’s national positions on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Those provisions include the reference to the final document (resolution S-10/2) of first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD-I), NAM summit statements, advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice, the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified time frame, the role and work of the Conference on Disarmament (CD), including the establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament in the CD as the highest priority, the negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty in the CD on the basis of the Shannon mandate, as well as the call for convening an international conference on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects at an early date to identify and deal with concrete measures of nuclear disarmament. We compliment Myanmar for achieving vital principled positions in this draft resolution, which has the support from the vast majority of countries.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.51, India respects the sovereign choice of non-nuclear-weapon States to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. That principle is consistent with the provisions of SSOD-I and the 1999 guidelines of the Disarmament Commission. India enjoys friendly and mutually beneficial relations with countries of the African continent. India shares and supports African aspirations for enhancing the region’s well-being and security. We respect the sovereign

choice of States parties to the Treaty of Pelindaba and applaud the successful entry into force of the Treaty. As a nuclear-weapon State, India conveys its unambiguous assurance that it will respect the status of the African nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Ms. González Román (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to provide an explanation of Spain’s position concerning draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.51, entitled “African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty”. The entry into force of the Treaty of Pelindaba, in 2009, represents an important contribution to strengthening international peace and security. For that reason, Spain has always unequivocally expressed its support for the aims of that Treaty and wishes once again to express its satisfaction regarding its entry into force.

Spain is also prepared to make the necessary efforts to ensure that States parties to the Treaty of Pelindaba acquire sufficient capacities for its effective implementation in their respective territories. The Government of Spain has closely studied the invitation to become party to Protocol III of the Treaty. My Government has therefore consulted with Parliament and taken into account the guidelines adopted by consensus by the Conference on Disarmament during its 1999 substantive session regarding the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones pursuant to arrangements freely arrived at among the countries of each region. As a result, the Government of Spain decided not to sign the Treaty, which was duly communicated to the depositary. In that regard, our delegation wishes to call attention to two matters.

First of all, the Treaty of Pelindaba does not contain any provision, obligation, guarantee or safeguard in the realm of disarmament and non-proliferation that Spain has not already adopted with respect to its entire national territory. In fact, Spain has committed itself to, and has for many years respected, a series of obligations and safeguards within the framework of the Treaty Establishing the European Atomic Energy Community and its safeguards agreement, supplemented by the Additional Protocol that Spain signed with the International Atomic Energy Agency, all of which go significantly beyond those contained in the Treaty of Pelindaba.

Secondly, we wish to state that the entire territory of Spain has been militarily nuclear-free since 1976. The prohibition to import, install or stockpile nuclear

weapons throughout Spanish territory was reiterated by Parliament when Spain joined NATO in 1981, and was also endorsed by a popular referendum held in March 1986. Spain has therefore already taken all the steps necessary to enable the provisions of the Pelindaba Treaty to be fully implemented throughout its national territory.

Spain has joined the consensus on this draft resolution since it was first introduced, in 1997. However, the Spanish delegation does not associate itself with that consensus when it comes to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. We once again call on the draft resolution's sponsors to hold transparent consultations in good faith in an effort to arrive at more balanced language that reflects existing realities and that will therefore be acceptable to all parties concerned with future draft resolutions of this kind. I would like to reiterate that Spain does not wish to modify either the Pelindaba Treaty or its Protocols, but merely paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.51.

Mr. Van den IJssel (Netherlands): I take the floor to explain our vote on paragraph 14 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49.

The Netherlands is fully committed to the full implementation of the action plan agreed on at the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. That plan contains actions on all three pillars of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT): disarmament, non-proliferation and the peaceful use of nuclear energy. For us, non-proliferation and disarmament in particular are facets of the same diamond. They are equally important and reinforce one another. It is therefore important to work towards the full implementation of all elements of the 2010 NPT action plan.

Mr. Kasianov (Ukraine) (*spoke in Russian*): I would also like to touch on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". I should note that my delegation is of course in favour of a nuclear-free world. Our goal should be the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. However, we voted against draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49 as a whole because we feel that some of its provisions are not entirely balanced.

We would like to ask the Secretariat to make two corrections to the paragraphs we voted on. The first

concerns the Review Conference and the second the fissile material cut-off treaty.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): I would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.49. My delegation voted in favour of retaining paragraph 14, with a view to achieving a balanced implementation of all three pillars of the action plan of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on Nuclear Non-Proliferation.

The Chair: The Committee has thus concluded action on the cluster 1 draft resolutions as contained in the first revision of informal paper 2.

The Committee will now proceed to cluster 2, entitled "Other weapons of mass destruction". Before the Committee takes a decision on the draft resolution submitted under that cluster, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to make either a general statement or to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. Ovsyanko (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to take this opportunity to once again draw attention to the subject of the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). Belarus, along with its co-sponsors, traditionally submits for the First Committee's consideration the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament". We would like to warmly thank the co-sponsors and the absolute majority of all Member States for their unwavering support for the draft resolution.

This is now the fourth decade that the Committee considers the subject of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction. Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.24 is intended to be exclusively preventive. In practice, we propose the creation of a reaction mechanism that could be activated if information should be found on the creation of any new WMDs. Keeping such a mechanism before the General Assembly and the Conference on Disarmament requires a minimal outlay of time and resources.

This draft resolution has been adopted by consensus for many years. It is difficult to argue with the fact that from both the humanitarian and financial points of view the right thing is to prohibit weapons of mass destruction at the development stage rather than

to try to prevent their proliferation or, as usually happens, to combat the consequences of their use once they already exist.

Since this item has been on the agenda in the various disarmament forums, proof of the development or creation of new WMDs has not been found. That may be due to the secrecy surrounding existing programmes. We hope that the draft resolution that is now before the First Committee, and which will eventually be before the General Assembly, will once again be adopted by consensus.

The position of a number of countries on this draft resolution has changed, and we wonder why that is the case. It is difficult for us to understand why some countries might be against this draft resolution. It is hardly likely that any countries in this room can guarantee that new types of WMDs cannot be developed, and this draft resolution is therefore of great importance. We call on all States to support it. We believe it is important that this matter remain on the agendas of the First Committee and the Conference on Disarmament.

The Chair: The Assembly will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.24. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.24, entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Belarus at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.24 and CRP.3/Rev.3. In addition, the delegation of Turkmenistan is also a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape

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

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Israel

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.24 was adopted by 173 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote following the adoption of the draft resolution.

Ms. Kennedy (United States of America): The United States voted against draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.24. Our delegation believes that the international community should focus its efforts on the very real problem of the proliferation of known types of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), both by States that wilfully violate their commitments with respect to existing treaties and also by non-State actors.

In the 63 years since the 1948 definition of WMDs was set forth, no new types of WMD have appeared on the horizon. The idea of new types of WMD beyond chemical, biological or radiological/nuclear remains entirely hypothetical. No useful purpose is served by diverting the attention and efforts of the international community away from existing threats to such hypothetical threats. For those reasons, we voted against the draft resolution.

The Chair: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of draft resolutions listed under cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction", in informal paper 2.

The Committee will now turn to cluster 4, entitled "Conventional weapons", to consider the draft resolutions submitted under that cluster, namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/66/L.17, A/C.1/66/L.18 and A/C.1/66/L.43. Before we proceed to take action, I shall give the floor to representatives who wish either to make a general statement, other than an explanation of vote, or to introduce a draft resolution under that cluster.

Mr. Eloumni (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): The absence of regulation and control of the use and transfer of small arms and light weapons contributes to their uncurbed proliferation in hotbeds of tension, particularly in Africa. That gives rise, in addition to human suffering, to unsustainable consequences for the stability and security of States, as well as for their socio-economic and human development.

The capacity to respond to the expectations of populations and civil society on this issue tests not only the efficacy of disarmament mechanisms as such, but also the United Nations system as a whole and the principles of its Charter. In that spirit, Morocco firmly supports the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, as well as International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and

Light Weapons. To that end, Morocco also supports the conclusion of an arms trade treaty, whose scope of application must of necessity be broadened to include small arms and light weapons.

Morocco believes that regional and subregional cooperation represents an essential tool for combating the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. The disturbing situation that exists the Sahelian-Saharan region due to the rise of the illegal arms trade, including in small arms and light weapons, as well as the relationships between arms trafficking networks and terrorist groups, more than ever require that we redouble our efforts to strengthen cooperation among the States of the region, based on an inclusive approach.

It is for those reasons that Morocco has become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/66/L.18 and A/C.1/66/L.43, which address the illicit trade in light weapons.

The Chair: Before we proceed to take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/66/L.17, A/C.1/66/L.18 and A/C.1/66/L.43, I call on the representative of Libya, who wishes to speak in explanation of position.

Mr. El-Mesallati (Libya) (*spoke in Arabic*): The Libyan delegation joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.17, 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". That does not mean that we accept in full the provisions of the Convention, because Libya is not a party to it. We therefore believe that the provisions and protocols of the Convention are limited to addressing only certain questions that relate to weapon remnants, including mines planted by warring parties in the lands of other countries during the Second World War, including in my country. The draft resolution also does not take into account the defence needs of some countries and the right to defend one's territory by appropriate means.

While my country shares the concerns of the international community with respect to the dangerous effects of certain conventional weapons, we believe that addressing that question requires sincere and transparent international cooperation that takes into account the concerns of all nations, especially developing ones.

In addition, we should find appropriate means to deter any aggression or threat of aggression against small countries. Most important of all is the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction, the worst of which are nuclear weapons, which represent the greatest danger to human life.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.17. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.17, 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", was introduced by the representative of Sweden, also on behalf of Bulgaria, at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.17.

With the permission of the Chair, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.17. This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 14 and 15 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.17, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the Fourth Review Conference of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, to be held from 14 to 25 November 2011, and other annual conferences and expert meetings of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II and Protocol V, as well as for any continuation of work after the meetings; and also requests the Secretary-General, in his capacity as depositary of the Convention and the Protocols thereto, to continue to inform the General Assembly periodically, by electronic means, of ratifications and acceptances of and accessions to the Convention, its amended article 1 and the Protocols thereto.

The Committee's attention is drawn to the fact that the respective cost estimates for servicing the three conferences of the High Contracting Parties to be held from 9 to 25 November 2011 have been prepared by

the Secretariat and approved by the Fourth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, held in Geneva on 24 November 2010, by the Fourth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol V, held in Geneva on 22 and 23 November 2010, and by the meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention held in Geneva on 25 and 26 November 2010.

In addition, the Committee's attention is drawn to the fact that the cost of the thirteenth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, of the Fifth Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol V, and the Fourth Review Conference of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in those meetings, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately.

The request that the Secretary-General render the necessary assistance and provides services to the Thirteenth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, to the Fifth Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol V, and the Fourth Review Conference of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention should thus have no financial implications on the regular budget of the United Nations.

Following the established practice, the Secretariat will prepare cost estimates for any continuation of the work after the conferences, for the approval of the High Contracting Parties.

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

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.17 would not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.17 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.17 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.18. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.18, entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them”, was introduced by the representative of Mali on behalf of States members of the Economic Community of West African States at the Committee’s 16th meeting, on 19 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.18 and CRP.3/Rev.3.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.18 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.43. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.43, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”, was introduced by the representative of Japan at the Committee’s 15th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.43 and CRP.3/Rev.3.

With the permission of the Chair, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.43. This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 6 and 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.43, the General Assembly would decide that, pursuant to its resolution 65/64, the second conference to review progress made in the implementation of the Programme of Action will be held in New York from 27 August to 7 September 2012; and decide that the preparatory committee for the review conference will be convened in New York from 19 to 23 March 2012.

The provisions for the implementation of those paragraphs of the draft resolution have been considered in under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management”,

section 4, “Disarmament”, and section 29D, “Office of Central Support Services”, in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.43 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee has thus concluded action on the draft resolutions under cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”, as contained in informal paper 2.

The Committee will now proceed to cluster 5, “Regional disarmament and security”, to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.22, entitled “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”. Before we do so, I shall give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who wishes to speak in explanation of position.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): As in previous years, my delegation will not participate in the Committee’s action on the draft resolution entitled “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”, contained this year in document A/C.1/66/L.22. Given the continuing crisis in the occupied Palestinian territory and the Zionist regime’s imposition on the people of Gaza of a very severe blockade, including in the Mediterranean area, the draft resolution does not reflect the facts of the situation in the occupied territory and is therefore far from dealing with reality in the region.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.22. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.22, entitled “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”, was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the Committee’s 18th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.22 and CRP.3/Rev.3.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.22 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee has thus concluded action on the draft resolution under cluster 5, “Regional disarmament and security”, as contained in informal paper 2.

The Committee will now proceed to cluster 6, “Other disarmament measures and international security”. Before the Committee takes decisions on the four draft resolutions under cluster 6 — namely, A/C.1/66/L.29, A/C.1/66/L.30, A/C.1/66/L.35 and A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1 — I shall give the floor to those delegations that wish to make either a general statement, other than an explanation of vote, or to introduce draft resolutions.

Mrs. Balaguer Labrada (Cuba) (spoke in Spanish): My delegation wishes to make a general statement concerning draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.30, “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”. The draft resolution addresses highly relevant issues, which is why we have decided to co-sponsor it once again this year. Cuba shares fully in the concerns expressed in the draft resolution about the use of information and telecommunications for purposes that are incompatible with international stability and security and that have a negative impact on States’ integrity. The draft resolution rightly emphasizes the need to prevent the use of resources, information and telecommunications for criminal or terrorist purposes.

Information and telecommunications systems can become weapons when they are designed and/or used in order to damage a State’s infrastructure, thereby jeopardizing international peace and security. The hostile use of telecommunications with the aim, declared or covert, of subverting a State’s internal domestic and political order is a violation of internationally recognized standards in this field and a negative and irresponsible use of such telecommunications systems, whose effects can create tensions and situations damaging to international peace and security, thereby undermining the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

In that context, my delegation once again feels compelled to denounce the radio and television aggression that the Government of the United States has carried out against Cuba for several decades, which violates the principles of international law and binding international standards in the area of regulation of the airwaves. That aggression has proceeded without thought for the irreparable damage it can do to international peace and security, and has created dangerous situations where military aircraft are used in order to broadcast television images to Cuba without its consent. More than 2,200 hours of illegal broadcasts, on 29 different frequencies, are made weekly to Cuba from United States territory.

As has been mentioned before, a number of those radio stations belong or provide services to organizations linked to known terrorist elements dwelling in United States territory and acting contrary to Cuban interests, broadcasting programmes calling for sabotage, political attacks, assassination and other acts of radio-terrorism. The World Radiocommunication Conference at Geneva has repeatedly spoken out against the illegality of such transmissions to Cuba and has called them contrary to radiocommunication regulations. My country will continue to take all possible measures to repel such aggressive and illegal actions, and will continue to condemn them in every possible international forums. We hope that draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.30 receives the support of a large majority of Member States, as has been the case in the past.

Mr. Norling (Sweden): I have the honour to make the following general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.30, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”. I speak on behalf of Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Switzerland and my own country, Sweden.

We join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.30. However, owing to recent developments in this field, we would like to stress some aspects that we believe are particularly relevant to Internet governance and related issues. One of the starting points for our delegations regarding key features of the Internet is that it should remain open and free. For us, one principle is very basic: the same universal rights that individuals enjoy offline, such as freedom of expression, including the freedom to seek information,

as well as freedom of assembly and association, must also be upheld and protected online. We agree that the role of the Internet in society is, to a great extent, a very positive one. We recognize that people all over the world use the Internet and information and communication technology to seek and share information, as well as to engage in political activity. Many human rights violations would most likely never have been reported if the Internet and information communication technology did not exist. Our delegations have consistently advocated that the consideration of human rights should permeate all issues relating to Internet governance, and that includes cyber-security issues. However, the current text of the draft resolution includes no direct references to a human-rights-based approach.

Another fundamental position for our delegations is that Internet governance should be based on a multi-stakeholder approach, including, for instance, private-sector and civil-society actors. That is particularly important when it comes to guaranteeing aspects of human rights in discussions of standards and rules of behaviour for the Internet. We look forward to taking an active part in the emerging international dialogue on Internet governance and other related issues, while underlining the fundamental importance of giving clear prominence to aspects of human rights and broad participation in that context.

Ms. Kennedy (United States of America): I would like to draw the Committee's attention to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments", introduced at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 14 October.

This is a draft resolution that we have sponsored for more than 25 years. The current draft resolution now has 66 sponsors, all of whom we thank. The revised version before the Committee includes two new paragraphs, 5 and 6, drawn from the compliance resolution adopted by consensus in 2002, and thus reflecting a consensus text (see General Assembly resolution 57/86). As in previous years, we hope for the broadest possible support for the draft resolution. Sending a strong and unified message on the importance of compliance with our obligations is as important as ever.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.29. A recorded vote has

been requested on the draft resolution as a whole. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7, and on paragraph 5 (b). I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.29, entitled "Transparency in armaments", was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.29 and CRP.3/Rev.3.

With the permission of the Chair, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.29. This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 5 (b) and paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.29, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts, to convene in 2012, within available resources, on the basis of equitable geographic representation, to prepare a report of the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, relevant deliberations within the United Nations, the views expressed by Member States and the reports of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, with a view to taking a decision at the sixty-eighth session; and to request the Secretary-General to implement the recommendations contained in his 2000, 2003, 2006 and 2009 reports (A/55/281, A/58/274, A/61/261 and A/64/296, respectively) on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, and to ensure that sufficient resources are being made available for the Secretariat to operate and maintain the Register.

The provisions for the implementation of the aforementioned paragraphs of the draft resolution have been considered under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management"; section 4, "Disarmament"; and section 29 D, "Office of General Support Services", in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.29, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

The Committee's attention is drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 65/259, of 24 December 2010, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters; and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

The Chair: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Comoros, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 150 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Operative paragraph 3 was retained by 150 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 4.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 151 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 5 (b).

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Operative paragraph 5 (b) was retained by 150 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 5 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Comoros, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia,

Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Operative paragraph 5, as a whole, was retained by 149 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on paragraph 7.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Operative paragraph 7 was retained by 150 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.29 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.29 was adopted by 149 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.30. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.30, 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 Committee’s 17th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.30 and CRP.3.

With the permission of the Chair, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.30. This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.30, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts, to be established in 2012 on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, taking into account the assessments and recommendations contained in the above-mentioned report, to continue to study existing and potential threats in the sphere of

information security and possible cooperative measures to address them, including norms, rules or principles of responsible behaviour of States and confidence-building measures with regard to information space, as well as the concepts referred to in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, and to submit a report on the results of this study to the Assembly at its sixty-eighth session.

Resolution 65/41 requested the Secretary-General to establish in 2012 the Group of Governmental Experts referred to in paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.30. The resources required for the three substantive sessions of the Group of Governmental Experts, the first of which is envisaged to be held in New York in 2012, and the second and third sessions in 2013, in Geneva and in New York, respectively, have already been included under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.30 would not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.30 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.35. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.35, entitled “Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures”, was introduced by the representative of Germany at the Committee’s 15th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.35 and CRP.3/Rev.3.

With the permission of the Chair, I will now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.35. This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 9 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i) and (j) of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.35, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, within available resources, to

continue the practice of sending an annual note verbale to Member States requesting the submission of their reports on military expenditures; too circulate annually a note verbale to Member States detailing which reports on military expenditures were submitted and are available electronically on the website for military expenditures; to continue consultations with relevant international bodies, with a view to ascertaining requirements for adjusting the present instrument, with a view to encouraging wider participation, and to make recommendations, based on the outcome of those consultations and taking into account the views of Member States, on necessary changes to the content and structure of the standardized reporting system; to encourage relevant international bodies and organizations to promote transparency of military expenditures and to consult with those bodies and organizations, with emphasis on examining possibilities for enhancing complementarities among international and regional reporting systems and for exchanging related information between those bodies and the United Nations; to continue to foster further cooperation with relevant regional organizations with a view to raising awareness of the United Nations report on military expenditures and its role as a confidence-building measure; to encourage the United Nations Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, in Asia and the Pacific, and in Latin America and the Caribbean to assist Member States in their regions in enhancing their knowledge of the standardized reporting system; to promote international and regional/subregional symposiums and training seminars to explain the purpose of the standardized reporting system and to give relevant technical instructions; to report on experiences gained during such symposiums and training seminars; to provide, upon request, technical assistance to Member States lacking the capacity to report data, as well as to encourage Member States to voluntarily provide bilateral assistance to other Member States; and to encourage the Office for Disarmament Affairs, with the financial and technical support of interested States, as appropriate, to continue to improve the existing database on military expenditures, with a view to making it more user-friendly and up-to-date technologically and to increasing its functionality.

The provisions for the implementation of the operation and paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.35, including resources to ensure the continuing operation of the standardized system for

reporting military expenditure, have been included under section 4, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. Should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.35, it would not give rise to any additional requirements under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section 6 of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B, of 24 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 65/259, of 24 December 2010, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with the responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.35 has expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.35 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments", was introduced by the representative of the United States of America at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 14 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1 and CRP.3/Rev.3.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

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

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): There must be a misunderstanding, as there was some communication with the Secretariat to request a vote.

The Chair: I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): I regret to inform the Committee that the Secretariat received no such request. This is the first time we are hearing of it and we are very happy to correct our records.

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

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): We have a copy of the e-mail that we sent in response to an e-mail that we received from the Secretariat.

The Chair: Perhaps it was misplaced in cyberspace. I understand, however, that a recorded vote is being requested. The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1 was adopted by 157 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee has now taken action on all four draft resolutions under cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security". I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position following the adoption of the draft resolutions.

Mrs. Balaguer Labrada (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.35, entitled "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures", which was adopted without a vote. The First Committee has addressed the subject of that draft resolution for many years now, in particular since 1980, when the General Assembly adopted, pursuant to resolution 35/142 B, the United Nations System for the Standardized Reporting of Military Expenditures. As in previous years, the Cuban delegation has joined the consensus on the draft resolution, with the understanding that such information is provided on a voluntary basis and bearing in mind that, as we mentioned earlier, any recommendation that may be made by the Group of Experts on the standardized instrument for reporting military expenditures should in no way modify the voluntary nature of that instrument.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): Before explaining Iran's vote, I would like to mention my appreciation for the efforts of the Secretariat. We know that they are extremely busy and working very hard. I hope that the misunderstanding will not happen again. I was consulting with some delegations and was sure

that the request had been submitted. Members saw the voting results.

I would like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.47/Rev.1. As a matter of principled position, the Islamic Republic of Iran strongly believes that all States must comply, on a non-discriminatory basis, with their obligations under all provisions of the treaties to which they are party. At the same time, we firmly believe that subjective and politically motivated unilateral assessments of non-compliance, attempts to use such assessments as foreign policy leverage and the instrumental use of international bodies would only undermine international efforts to strengthen an effective global disarmament and non-proliferation regime.

As in other agreements, international disarmament and non-proliferation instruments identify the rights and obligations of States parties. In our view, any restriction or denial of the rights of States parties enshrined in those instruments, such as the inalienable right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, as set forth in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), constitutes an obvious case of non-compliance with the provisions of such treaties.

With regard to the content of the draft resolution, in terms of its merits, we are satisfied that it refers to the concept of compliance as a contribution to efforts to prevent the "development of weapons of mass destruction". Like the other sponsors of the draft resolution, paragraph 8 of which urges those States not currently in compliance with their respective obligations and commitments to make the strategic decision to come back into compliance, we urge those States that are currently not in compliance with their respective obligations under articles I and II and, in particular, article VI of the NPT, to make a strategic decision and to fully and immediately meet such obligations.

The development of new types of nuclear weapons and their modernization by certain nuclear-weapon States is indeed in contravention of their obligations under the NPT. Undoubtedly, the continued failure of such States to comply with their obligations under the NPT and their unequivocal commitments undertaken at the 1995, 2000 and 2010 NPT Review Conferences will undermine the viability and effectiveness of, and confidence in, the Treaty.

Those countries that are in non-compliance with their obligations under article II of the NPT by stationing nuclear warheads on their soil should also come back into compliance. In that context, just as the main sponsor of the draft resolution calls on other States to do, we strongly urge that country, as the major possessor of chemical weapons, to comply fully and immediately with the final extended deadline of 29 April for the total destruction of its chemical weapons. Any such non-compliance, as stated in the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, "not only adversely affects the security of States parties but also can create security risks for other States relying on the constraints and commitments stipulated in those agreements".

In our view, the draft resolution continues to suffer from basic substantive shortcomings, including the following.

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

Secondly, the central role of international organizations such as the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, which are responsible for the verification of compliance by States parties with disarmament and non-proliferation instruments in accordance with the procedures defined in those agreements, is overlooked.

Thirdly, consultation and cooperation among States parties to the relevant instruments in resolving their concerns with regard to compliance, as well as on implementation in accordance with the procedures defined in those treaties, are essential in promoting multilateralism and the full and effective implementation of such instruments. Regrettably, that fundamental principle has been totally ignored in the draft resolution.

Fourthly, compliance is a very important legal issue. Therefore, precision and clarity are needed for any text with that sensitive question. The content of this draft resolution lacks such quality. It looks like a political statement that serves only the narrow political objective of a few countries. None of the internationally agreed texts is included in this draft resolution.

Fifthly, last but not least, we cannot agree to an approach that supports national technical means for verification, compliance and enforcement. Such an approach, which tends to be implemented on the basis of politically motivated assumptions, would lead to resorting to unilateralism and would undermine the multilaterally agreed verification mechanisms. It is also ironic that the regime that is not party to any weapons of mass destruction-related international instruments and that continues to develop all kinds of weapons of mass destruction has become a sponsor of this draft resolution and shamelessly urges Member States to comply with such instruments.

It is for those reasons that my delegation did not participate in the voting on the draft resolution.

The Chair: We have exhausted the time allotted to us today. There are still several speakers who wish to explain their votes or positions following the adoption of the draft resolutions under this cluster. We will hear the remaining speakers tomorrow at 3 p.m. Thereafter, we will take action on the drafts listed in informal paper 2 under cluster 7, entitled “Disarmament machinery”. And then we will circulate informal paper 3 and take action on 12 more drafts contained therein. My intention is to conclude our work by tomorrow evening.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.