



General Assembly

Sixty-fifth session

First Committee

23rd meeting

Friday, 29 October 2010, 3 p.m.

New York

Chair: Miloš Koterec (Slovakia)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda items 88 to 104 and 162 (continued)

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

The Chair: I shall now call on those representatives remaining on the list of speakers in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions adopted at the 22nd meeting under cluster, “Nuclear weapons”.

Mr. Lindell (Sweden): My delegation wishes to make a few brief remarks in order to clarify our position on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.50, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*”.

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 one of the preambular paragraphs that were added to the draft resolution this year, namely, the fifteenth, in which note is taken 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.

Mr. Macedo Soares (Brazil): My delegation would like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1, and specifically to explain its vote in favour of paragraph 7.

Paragraph 7 refers to the question of the negotiation by the Conference on Disarmament of a treaty banning the production of fissile materials for use in nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, on which the position of Brazil is well known. We believe that commencing negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile materials for use in nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices does not prejudice the outcome of those negotiations, which in our view should also take into consideration all other aspects related to those fissile materials. We believe that any treaty banning the production of fissile materials for use in nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices should serve the objectives of both non-proliferation and effective nuclear disarmament.

I should also like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1. Although Brazil has not adhered to The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution. We did so because we acknowledge and respect the fact that 131 States have already subscribed to the Code as a practical step against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

We also recognize the importance, as referred to in the third preambular paragraph, of regional and international efforts to prevent and curb comprehensively the proliferation of ballistic missile systems capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, as a contribution to international peace and security. Furthermore, we welcome the view expressed in the eighth preambular paragraph that States should

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.



not be excluded from utilizing the benefits of space for peaceful purposes. Having said that, I must stress that Brazil is not in a position to endorse the thrust of paragraph 2, which invites all States that have not yet subscribed to the Code of Conduct to do so.

Finally, I would like to express my delegation's appreciation for the openness shown by the delegation of France in conducting consultations on this draft resolution.

Ms. Moal-Makame (France) (*spoke in French*): My delegation thanks the representative of Brazil for his kind words addressed to France. I should also like to inform the Secretariat that Germany has become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.46/Rev.1, entitled "Preventing the acquisition by terrorists of radioactive sources".

Mr. Ja'afari (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My country joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1, entitled "Bilateral reductions of strategic nuclear arms and the new framework for strategic relations". However, we should have liked the text to take account of the two amendments submitted by Iran in documents A/C.1/65/L.59 and A/C.1/65/L.60, which are well founded and precise.

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt): I take the floor to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation".

The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation is a product of exclusive export control regimes developed outside the United Nations in a discriminatory manner. Egypt strongly believes that, in addition to its voluntary, non-verifiable nature, the Code is neither balanced in its approach nor comprehensive in its scope. By focusing on the issue of ballistic missiles while ignoring more advanced means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction — such as cruise missiles and others — the Code only adds to its weakness in promoting the peaceful use of space technologies. The Code has failed significantly since its adoption to develop in a manner that may address the aforementioned weaknesses and shortcomings.

On the basis of our firm believe that any consideration of the issue of missiles can take place only in the context of the United Nations if it is to enjoy both legitimacy and effectiveness, this year

Egypt has co-sponsored draft decision A/C.1/65/L.18, entitled "Missiles", aimed at keeping the issue on the agenda of the United Nations and reflecting our support for addressing this issue in an inclusive and comprehensive manner in the multilateral context of the United Nations.

Allow me also to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1, and in particular in the separate vote on paragraph 7. We voted in favour of the paragraph and joined the consensus on the draft resolution. Nevertheless, we would like to reiterate our position on the importance of starting negotiations within a balanced and comprehensive programme of work at the Conference on Disarmament on nuclear disarmament, negative security assurances, the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and an internationally verifiable treaty banning the production and stockpiling of fissile materials for use in nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

The Chair: The Committee has thus concluded action on cluster 1.

The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in cluster 3, "Outer space (disarmament aspects)".

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

Ms. Kennedy (United States of America): The United States will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.38. The United States is committed to pursuing pragmatic and voluntary bilateral and multilateral transparency- and confidence-building measures (TCBMs) to mitigate the risk of mishaps, misperceptions and mistrust in outer space.

We very much appreciate in particular the efforts of Russia to develop a draft resolution that advances our shared goals of developing pragmatic transparency and confidence-building measures TCBMs. In particular, we are supportive of the draft resolution's establishment of a group of governmental experts to examine voluntary and pragmatic TCBMs in space that solve concrete problems. We cannot, however, support the draft resolution's reference to the draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of force against outer space objects, for reasons we discussed in the thematic debate.

However, the United States will continue vigorously to pursue bilateral and multilateral TCBMs, especially with our partners in Russia, and we look forward to working with our colleagues in the international community on this effort in the group of governmental experts.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.38. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.38, entitled “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”, was submitted by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 18th meeting, on 25 October 2010. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.38 and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.4. In addition, Pakistan has become a co-sponsor.

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.1/65/L.38, entitled “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”. This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

In paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to establish, on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, a group of governmental experts to conduct a study, commencing in 2012, on outer space transparency and confidence-building measures, making use of the relevant reports of Secretary-General, including the final report, submitted to the General Assembly at its sixty-fifth session, and without prejudice to the substantive discussions on the prevention of an arms race in outer space within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament, and to submit to the General Assembly at its sixty-eighth session a report containing in its annex the study of governmental experts; and also request the Secretary-General to provide the group of governmental experts with any assistance and services, within existing resources, that may be required for the discharge of its tasks.

Pursuant to the request contained in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the group of governmental experts would hold three sessions of

one-week’s duration each — two in New York in 2012 and 2013 and one in Geneva in 2013. Specifically, for the first session to be held in New York in 2012, interpretation services from and into the six official languages would be required for the 10 meetings, and in addition 13 documents totalling 112,700 words would be required to be translated into the six official languages. For the second session to be held in Geneva in 2013, interpretation services from and into the six official languages would be required for the 10 meetings, and in addition 15 documents totalling 129,700 words would be required to be translated into the six official languages. For the third session to be held in New York in 2013, interpretation services from and into the six official languages would be required for the 10 meetings, and in addition 15 documents totalling 129,700 words would be required to be translated into the six official languages.

The total resources required to service the three sessions of the group of governmental experts in 2012 and 2013 are estimated to be \$2,798,400, including \$2,384,900 for meetings and documentation services under section 2, “General Assembly, Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management”; \$10,000 under section 28 D, “Office of Central Support Services”; and \$4,000 under section 28 E, “Administration, Geneva” for the costs of sound technicians and technical support costs during the meetings; and \$399,500 under section 4, “Disarmament”, for the travel costs of experts and costs of consultants to provide substantive services to the proposed group of governmental experts.

These requirements would be considered within 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.38, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011. The additional financial implications would be considered in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

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

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

The attention of the First Committee is also drawn to paragraph 67 of the first report of the Advisory Committee on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001 (A/54/7), in which the Committee noted that the use of the phrase “within existing resources” or similar language in resolutions had a negative impact on the implementation of activities; therefore, efforts should be made to avoid the use of this phrase in resolutions and decisions.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, 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:

None

Abstaining:

United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.38 was adopted by 167 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The Chair: The Committee has thus concluded its action under cluster 3. We will now proceed to take action under cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”. I shall first give the floor to representatives who wish to make general statements, other than explanations of vote, or to introduce draft resolutions.

I give the floor to the representative of Colombia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*.

Mrs. Escorcía (Colombia): I would like to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”.

After a lengthy and extensive process of open and bilateral consultations, the co-authors of the draft resolution arrived at a text that we were certain could enjoy the widest possible support. Throughout that process of consultations, the co-authors tried very hard to accommodate each and every one of the suggestions made, as well as to seek the language that was best suited to fit the suggestions presented by Member States. In fact, this text now has the support of approximately 82 countries as sponsors.

As it stands, draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* contributes to keeping the process moving ahead, as it contains elements that are mentioned for the first time in any resolution on small arms and light weapons. This is one of the main reasons that we the co-authors consider it important that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. It is certainly important to keep in mind that the United Nations Programme of Action is a consensus-based process. To make substantial advances in its implementation, it is, without any doubt, necessary to count on the broader support of Member States. Adopting the draft resolution without a vote will contribute to reinforcing the Programme of Action process, and in particular future meetings such as those of the Group of Experts and the 2012 Review Conference.

We the co-authors regret that a draft proposal is to be introduced that intends to affect the delicate balance of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*. We the co-authors therefore appeal to the main sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.1/65/L.61 to withdraw their proposal, to join the consensus and to work together in supporting the United Nations Programme of Action. Bearing in mind the importance of combating illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects, we request Member States to renew their commitment to the Programme of Action through the adoption of the proposed text of the draft resolution, without taking into account any draft amendment that may arise.

Based on the all the elements to which I have referred, we the co-authors have decided to vote against any intention to amend draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*. We encourage all Member States to do the same. Members should be certain that we do so based on principles rather than on the substance of the proposals to be presented.

Mr. Suda (Japan): Together with Colombia and South Africa, Japan presented draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* to the Committee, as we have done every year. Under the coordination of Colombia, we have conducted intensive discussions on the draft resolution, through several informal consultations, in an open and transparent manner. We have made the utmost effort to accommodate to the maximum possible extent all of the views expressed by Member States on the draft resolution. We are thankful to the approximately 80 countries that joined as sponsors. All of the sponsors, including my country, strongly believe

that draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* can receive the highest possible support and be adopted by consensus.

We therefore deeply regret that an amendment proposed to the draft resolution was actually submitted. Japan itself is not particularly concerned with the content of the amendment. Indeed, we put forward the same language found in paragraph 16 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.61, at the beginning of the informal consultations on our own draft resolution. However, we have found, as have many other participants, that the language therein could not command consensus. We therefore propose the current, more generally worded paragraph 16 of A/C.1/65/L.32* so as to make it acceptable to every Member State. It is clear that consensus cannot be reached on the amendment to paragraph 16.

With regard to the proposed amendment to paragraph 20, although we received the proposal at the very last stage, we did manage to consult with the sponsors. We came to the conclusion, however, that the proposal also did not lead to consensus.

We think that proposing such amendments, on which consensus cannot be reached at this stage, is counterproductive and could have a negative effect on the future process of the Programme of Action. We believe the consensual adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* is of the utmost importance in our continued joint efforts to tackle the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. Therefore, we strongly hope that the draft resolution will be unanimously adopted without any amendments.

My delegation would like to appeal to all delegations to support draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* as it is and to join the overwhelming consensus.

Mr. Seruhere (United Republic of Tanzania): The United Republic of Tanzania is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*, in pursuit of consensus and in order to allow debate to continue.

Tanzania sponsored Security Council resolution 1653 (2006), which addressed the issue of entirely outlawed rebel groups in the Great Lakes region of Africa. Those rebel groups used small arms and light weapons and wreaked havoc in the region.

In the same vein, the United Republic of Tanzania ratified the Pact on Security, Stability and Development in the Great Lakes Region. The Pact includes a protocol on non-aggression and mutual

defence, which promotes efforts to end the illicit proliferation of small arms and light weapons, including cooperation across borders to curb crime and establish peace and security.

Tanzania is also a member of the Nairobi Protocol for the Prevention, Control and Reduction of Small Arms and Light Weapons in the Great Lakes Region and the Horn of Africa, as well as of the Regional Centre on Small Arms and Light Weapons. Tanzania has been at the forefront of United Nations and subregional efforts in implementing peace initiatives, in which former President of Nigeria Obasanjo and former President of Tanzania Mkapa worked on behalf of the United Nations in the subregion.

My delegation wishes to bring to the attention of this Committee that borders in the Great Lakes region are porous and criminals can move easily across them. My delegation therefore subscribes to the idea of enhancing and promoting national controls, as enshrined in paragraph 16 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*. However, that may not be enough, especially for individual Member States with limited resources that cannot wait for an unknown time in the future when resources would be abundant. Hence, they need to conduct joint border operations. I rest my case.

Mr. Janssens de Bisthoven (Belgium): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union, which would strongly prefer that draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects", be adopted without any amendments. We repeatedly expressed readiness to support the adoption of the draft resolution without further changes, as we consider it to be a compromise on which a consensus could be found.

We are concerned that the adoption of amendments could compromise the positive momentum that the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects has recently experienced, as demonstrated most recently by the successful outcome of the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States, held in June 2010.

The preservation of consensus in the implementation of the Programme of Action process remains a priority for us. It is important not to compromise the steps that we must take in the future to implement the Programme of Action.

Last but not least, the European Union would like to praise the authors of the draft resolution for their work and consultations.

Mr. Arrocha (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): On behalf of the sponsor countries of Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Burundi, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda and my own country of Mexico, I would like to introduce the amendments contained in document A/C.1/65/L.61.

The delegation of Mexico believed that, as prepared by its authors, the original text of the draft omnibus resolution was a balanced and substantive document that adequately reflected the major progress made during the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

Nevertheless, throughout the process that is concluding today, a number of changes were made that in Mexico's view were significantly detrimental to the efforts that all Member States have made over the past year. Those changes also do not adequately reflect the progress made in the context of the Fourth Biennial Meeting, in particular when it comes to the recognition of the urgent need to prevent and combat the illicit cross-border trade in arms, as well as the importance for the 2012 Review Conference to seek to strengthen follow-up mechanisms of the Programme of Action.

It is important to underscore that the Fourth Biennial Meeting managed to adopt, for the first time in the nine years of the existence of the Programme of Action, a substantive final document (A/CONF.192/BMS/2010/3) with the agreement of all States. At this juncture, my delegation wonders about the purpose of pursuing the adoption of documents by consensus if they cannot subsequently be invoked or endorsed in the relevant contexts. My delegation very much regrets that the conduct of the negotiations did not give pride of place to the inclusion of constructive proposals seeking to make meaningful progress towards preventing and combating the weapons trade, but instead opened up leeway to positions that seek to maintain the status quo.

Mexico, along with the countries I referred to earlier, has submitted amendments that stem from the language that was agreed in the final document of the

Fourth Biennial Meeting — in paragraphs 2 and 49, respectively — and that furthermore were part of the text that the delegations of Colombia, Japan and South Africa introduced to the membership in their original draft resolution.

In Mexico's view, the Programme of Action is one of the most important documents in the area of international security. Beyond that, however, Mexico is fully convinced that the full implementation of the Programme constitutes an essential tool to saving the thousands of lives lost daily throughout the world to illegal weapons, especially in the regions of the countries sponsoring these amendments. Mexico takes its full responsibility in protecting those human lives. We are therefore prepared to continue to make the utmost effort to strengthen the Programme of Action and to ensure that the United Nations sends a clear message about its responsibility in thwarting such criminal activity.

Mexico, like many of the States sitting in this Committee, suffers directly from the devastating consequences of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. As an affected State, we therefore appeal to all delegations to reflect on the process we have witnessed over the past few weeks and, when casting their votes, consider whether the time has come to prevent the few from maintaining the status quo instead of making real progress towards preventing and combating the illegal weapons trade.

Lastly, my delegation wishes to clarify that the text that has been submitted in document A/C.1/65/L.32* has never enjoyed consensus. The introduction of these amendments therefore cannot be understood as breaching an agreement that does not exist.

Ms. Haynes (Trinidad and Tobago): I have the honour to make this intervention on behalf of the 14 member States of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) in respect of the action to be taken today under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

CARICOM member States have always maintained strong support for the annual draft resolution adopted in the First Committee on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects. This year is no exception. CARICOM also maintains its unwavering support for the full implementation of the 2001 Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light

Weapons in All Its Aspects, which remains the principal international framework for combating the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. We look forward to playing an active role in the 2011 open-ended meeting of governmental experts and the 2012 Review Conference.

At the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action, held in June, Member States adopted by consensus a report that highlighted the way forward in effectively combating and eradicating the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects (A/CONF.192/BMS/2010/3).

For CARICOM, the way forward necessitates an acknowledgement of all facets of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, including its cross-border nature as well as the negative socio-economic effects of this illegal trade. The cross-border character of the problem has led to a multiplicity of problems in our region. It has caused illegal guns to be placed in the hands of criminals, which in turn has caused an elevation in the murder rate in the region to unacceptable levels. This type of problem, however, is not limited to CARICOM. In other regions there has also been an increase in armed violence, as well as an expansion of the illegal narcotics trade.

We have consistently articulated this position in diverse forums, including here at the United Nations. During the recently concluded general debate at the opening of the present session of the General Assembly, our leaders once again called for international action to address this problem.

From the perspective of CARICOM, the acknowledgement of the cross-border nature of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons is an indication of the necessity for an integrated global response that will supplement actions at the national, regional and subregional levels in order to combat, and indeed eradicate, the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. It is for this reason that CARICOM has found it imperative to support the language that has been introduced by Mexico. It is necessary to point out that this language is agreed language contained in the consensual final document of the Fourth Biennial Meeting.

CARICOM States always strive to achieve consensus and compromise and to work for the greater good. We have always employed those values in our

efforts at creating an environment that is safe and secure for our people. Some of the success we have achieved in this area has been eroded because of the negative impact of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons on our societies.

We are stout defenders of multilateralism as the most effective means of solving international problems. As such, we call on all delegations to recognize the value of the paragraphs under consideration for the improvement of the text of the draft resolution. It is for this reason that we urge all delegations to support the amendments that have been proposed by Mexico.

Mr. Rowe (Sierra Leone): I speak today on behalf of one of the States most seriously affected by the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. It should therefore be no surprise to any delegation in the room today that Sierra Leone is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*.

We understand and respect the views of Mexico and the reasons behind its amendments. My delegation collaborated with the delegation of Mexico and various bodies dealing with small arms and light weapons, such as the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty and the Biennial Meeting of States on Small Arms. I also recall the marking and tracing process, where Mexico and Sierra Leone fought hard, and lost, because we wanted that instrument to be legally binding.

I am afraid, however, that my delegation believes that we should all work together today. We appeal to Mexico, as one of the most seriously affected countries, to join us in supporting draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* in order to enable the Committee to adopt it by consensus.

Mr. Obisakin (Nigeria): I had decided to keep quiet. Of course, Nigeria is not a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*. I am just taking the floor to strongly appeal for the adoption of a consensus document.

We know the impact. We have sung it in musical terms. We have whispered that the movement of illicit small arms and light weapons across our borders has caused us many problems. Almost everybody knows about the very strong Economic Community of West African States convention, which has already entered into force.

However, we prefer that we leave here with a consensus document. We support draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* as originally proposed. Nobody can beat a drum with a sickle. It is when lions hunt together that they always win.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the remaining draft resolution under cluster 4. I shall first call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt): Of course, I cannot beat my dear colleague and friend from Nigeria Lawrence when it comes to lions, but allow me to present Egypt's explanation of vote before the voting on the amendments contained in document A/C.1/65/L.61.

At a time of enhancing and strengthening the disarmament machinery and our international collective efforts in the field of international security and disarmament, the delegation of Egypt expresses its grave concern about the attempts manifested by the amendments presented to document A/C.1/65/L.61. They can only result in undermining the collective efforts undertaken by the international community as a whole to eradicate and combat the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons through the full implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action on Small Arms, adopted by consensus in 2001.

We believe that the text presented in document A/C.1/65/L.32*, which was discussed and agreed to during the extensive consultations undertaken by the sponsors of the draft resolution, and even beyond — an effort for which we thank them — represents a balanced text that takes on board all concerns and can secure consensus. We therefore view attempts to disrupt the collective nature of our efforts to implement the Programme of Action as seriously undermining an international consensual instrument of the utmost importance to the maintenance of international peace and security.

My delegation will therefore vote against the amendments proposed in document A/C.1/65/L.61.

Mr. Bavaud (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the amendments contained in document A/C.1/65/L.61.

Switzerland would like to underscore that it has no substantive issue with the amendments proposed by Mexico. However, Switzerland will vote against any amendment that is not agreed by consensus.

Switzerland is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*, whose integrity we would like to maintain. We do so because, first, we believe that the draft resolution reflects the best balance to ensure the greatest support for the small arms and light weapons process and its Programme of Action within the United Nations; and, secondly, because we attach great importance to ensuring priority treatment for the issue of small arms and light weapons.

Mr. Macedo Soares (Brazil): I would like to make an explanation of vote before the First Committee takes action on document A/C.1/65/L.32* in order to place on record our position regarding the draft amendments to it.

The Brazilian delegation is a sponsor of this draft resolution, presented by Colombia, South Africa and Japan. We consider that text as a balanced and comprehensive approach to the issue of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects. We believe that any amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* will depart from the main objective of the initiative, which is fostering progress on the implementation of the Programme of Action in a consensual manner.

My delegation will therefore vote against any amendments proposed to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*.

Ms. De Zoeten (Australia): I have taken the floor to explain my delegation's vote against document A/C.1/65/L.61, which contains amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects.

My delegation wishes to associate itself with the statements made by the representatives of Colombia and Japan on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*. Australia is a sponsor of that draft resolution, and a strong supporter of the small arms process and the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

Our vote on the amendments does not reflect Australia's position on the substance of the text. Our vote reflects our role as a sponsor and our support for the text as it stands. It also reflects the value we place on preserving the consensus that the draft resolution has previously enjoyed and on preserving the spirit of consensus in the process more broadly.

It is for that reason, and with much reluctance, that we will vote against these amendments and, indeed, any amendments to the text.

Mr. Toro (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela will not support the proposed amendments contained in document A/C.1/65/L.61 to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects". We believe that the amendments are an attempt to divert attention from the main purpose of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, which is to adopt a comprehensive approach to the issue of illicit trafficking in such weapons, to a single issue, such as border controls.

We express our reservations with regard to such initiatives, which seek to only partially address the problem by emphasizing a single aspect of it, to the detriment of the holistic vision that was already agreed upon in the Programme of Action, and to alter the balance of the draft resolution.

The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons is an important issue on the disarmament agenda, given the negative repercussions of such illicit activity on States, especially those being affected by internal conflict. There is therefore a need to continue to join forces through international cooperation so as to prevent, combat and eradicate that illicit activity. Such efforts should be in keeping with the rules and principles of international law and the fundamental responsibility of States to take appropriate measures, based on the Programme of Action, to counter the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela reaffirms its support for the Programme of Action as a pre-eminent, holistic and balanced political tool for channelling the necessary international cooperation and assistance efforts to counter that illicit activity. We are convinced that efforts to strengthen the Programme of Action require the international community to continue its efforts, with a view to bolstering its comprehensive approach as a mechanism that complements national efforts to address the issue.

It is for those reasons that we reject these initiatives aimed at distorting the systemic approach required to address this issue.

Mr. Suda (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's vote prior to the voting on document A/C.1/65/L.61.

My delegation would like to clearly state that Japan will vote against the proposed amendments to the draft resolution in the light of the background I set out and the reasons I mentioned in my general statement.

Mr. Gumbi (South Africa): I take the floor in explanation of vote before the voting on the amendments proposed by the sponsors of document A/C.1/65/L.61. In that connection, let me first express South Africa's full support for the statement delivered by the representative of Colombia on behalf of the sponsors.

It is unfortunate that we have to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*, which is before us. South Africa believes that our efforts to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons should unite, and not divide, us. We are disappointed with this unfortunate development, in spite of efforts made over the years and during this session to hold wide consultations so as to present a text that strikes a delicate balance among the implementation of and undertakings called for in the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

The prevailing disunity on the draft resolution contradicts what we agreed upon in the Programme of Action, namely, that we would implement our undertakings "bearing in mind the different situations, capacities and priorities of States and regions" (*A/CONF.192/15, section II, para. 1*).

We are disappointed that this unfortunate development is also taking place in spite of the fact that we agreed, nine years ago, that we would not allow our differences on implementation in such areas as reinforcement, legislation, setting up national arms control structures, marking and tracing, brokering, storage and safekeeping and border controls to prevent the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus. We agreed on that approach, fully aware that building and reaching consensus involved a process of give and take for the sake of reaching middle ground on some of the issues where the views of Member States were diametrically opposed.

South Africa will vote against the two draft amendments presented by the sponsors of document A/C.1/65/L.61. As co-authors, we have made an honest attempt to reflect the elements that should guide our efforts in the field of small arms and light weapons in the foreseeable future, bearing in mind our different situations, capacities and priorities. South Africa will vote against those proposals because of our belief in respecting the principle that I have just spelled out. The same goes for any other proposal that may be made when we take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*.

Regardless of the outcome of the voting on document A/C.1/65/L.61, my delegation will support and vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*, which South Africa regards as the framework or road map for our work ahead on the implementation of the Programme of Action on Small Arms.

Mr. Simpson (New Zealand): New Zealand understands the reasons that led to the introduction of the amendments proposed in document A/C.1/65/L.61. Agreed language on illicit trade across borders and the strengthening of the follow-up mechanisms of the Programme of Action represent two key substantive outcomes of the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States, held in June, that have helped to take forward our collective work on combating the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons.

It is therefore disappointing that it proved impossible to reach an agreement on including language from the outcome of the Fourth Biennial Meeting, which was adopted by Member States by consensus, in the draft resolution. That is especially so given the importance placed on the issue by many Member States, in particular, as we have heard today, by many of those States most seriously affected by small arms and light weapons and related armed violence.

However, consensus within the Programme of Action has been hard won. It should not be abandoned lightly. As a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*, we have appreciated the efforts by the three lead sponsors — in particular by Colombia, this year's coordinator — to produce a text they believed most likely to preserve that consensus. Those efforts have been particularly important for laying a solid foundation for the open-ended meeting of

governmental experts to be held in May next year and for a successful Review Conference in 2012.

Importantly, they have also endorsed the outcomes of the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States. New Zealand believes it to be important for this draft resolution, which establishes a clear path for the Programme of Action over the coming two years, to be adopted by consensus. With regret, New Zealand is therefore unable to support the proposed amendments.

Looking forward, two things are clear. First, for the Programme of Action to remain viable as a consensus process, the legitimate concerns and sensitivities of Member States need to be respected; but for it to be meaningful and effective, so too must the needs and priorities of those States most affected by small arms-related violence. New Zealand remains of the view that, on issues like those covered by the amendments proposed in document A/C.1/65/L.61, those considerations need not be mutually exclusive. It should be possible for Member States to have a dialogue on such issues within the Programme of Action in a manner that reconciles those two. New Zealand hopes that over the coming months it will be possible to work with all Member States calmly, constructively and flexibly towards achieving that consensus.

The Chair: I would kindly ask delegations to limit their explanations to a minimum, because we need the presence of the interpreters to conduct the voting and we are in danger of not being able to finish.

Mr. Carrión-Mena (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall be brief too. I just want to state clearly why Ecuador will vote against the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*, contained in document A/C.1/65/L.61.

Ecuador believes that the draft resolution is sufficiently even-handed and reflects the positions of all the States in this room. For that reason, any change to the text would alter the hard-won consensus.

Ecuador would also like to call attention to the fact that these sorts of proposals alter and distract from the very purpose and substance of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*. They also alter the course of the debate and the draft resolution's adoption. That is because putting forward a draft proposal with so little time beforehand might be misinterpreted.

My country will therefore support draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* and will vote against the proposed amendments in document A/C.1/65/L.61.

Mrs. Moreno (Paraguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Paraguayan delegation is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects". My delegation believes that it is important to reach consensus on this draft resolution. With a view to maintaining the integrity of the text, my delegation will vote against any amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*.

Mr. Wang Qun (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): If the amendments proposed to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* in document A/C.1/65/L.61 are put to the vote, China will not participate in the voting. However, if draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* as a whole is put to the vote, China will vote in favour of it.

We do not believe that the differences over paragraphs 16 and 20 of the draft resolution constitute an issue that should compel us to come up with amendments or a vote. We will therefore not participate in the voting on document A/C.1/65/L.61.

We believe that this kind of issue should properly be resolved through consultations and dialogue. Proposing amendments and calling for a vote are not likely to help us resolve the issues at hand. We support the statement made by the representative of Nigeria in this regard.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* contained in document A/C.1/65/L.61, which was submitted by the delegation of Mexico. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Iraq, Jamaica, Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, Uruguay

Against:

Afghanistan, Australia, Bahrain, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea,

Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Georgia, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen

Abstaining:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Zambia

The amendments contained in document A/C.1/65/L.61 were rejected by 54 votes to 19, with 70 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* was introduced earlier in this meeting by the representative of Colombia, also on behalf of Japan and South Africa. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.32* and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.5. I should like to inform the Committee that the Dominican Republic, Kyrgyzstan and Panama have also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

With the permission of the Chair, I shall now read out for the record an oral statement by the Secretary-

General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*.

This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. In paragraphs 6, 17, 18 and 20 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide that, in conformity with resolution 64/50, the open-ended meeting of governmental experts convened to address key implementation challenges and opportunities relating to particular issues and themes, including international cooperation and assistance, shall be held in New York from 9 to 13 May 2011; recall its decision to convene a conference to review progress made in the implementation of the Programme of Action, for a period of two weeks in New York in 2012; decide to convene a preparatory committee for the review conference for no longer than a total of five working days, in New York in early 2012; and recognize that to strengthen the implementation of the Programme of Action, the 2012 Review Conference may consider recommending convening a further open-ended meeting of governmental experts. It is recalled that the meetings indicated in paragraphs 6 and 17 were mandated by the General Assembly in resolution 63/72.

Therefore, resources for the open-ended meeting of governmental experts to be held in New York in May 2011, in accordance with paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, have already been included in the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011, and the meeting has been included in the calendar of conferences and meetings of the United Nations for 2011.

With regard to convening a conference for a period of two weeks in New York in 2012 to review progress made in the implementation of the Programme of Action, as recalled in paragraph 17 of the draft resolution, resources required to service the conference, which were estimated at \$429,500 in 2008, before the adoption of resolution 63/72, will be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

Pursuant to paragraph 18 of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the preparatory committee will hold one session in New York for five days, tentatively in March 2012, thus requiring interpretation services from and into the six official languages for 10 meetings and translation into the six official languages of 62 documents totalling 135,000 words. The total resources

required to service the preparatory committee in 2012 are estimated at \$954,400, including \$949,400 for meetings and documentation services under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management", and \$5,000 under section 28D, "Office of Central Support Services", for sound, technician and technical support costs during the meetings.

In accordance with paragraph 20 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would recognize that the 2012 Review Conference may consider recommending the convening of a further open-ended meeting of governmental experts. It is envisaged that the open-ended meeting of governmental experts would hold one session in New York for five days and would require interpretation services from and into the six official languages and translation services for 17 documents totalling 23,000 words. The total resources required to service the open-ended meeting in 2013 are estimated at \$272,700, including \$267,700 for meetings and documentation services under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management", and \$5,000 under section 28D, "Office of Central Support Services", for sound, technician and technical support costs during the meeting.

As those requirements are, however, subject to the conclusions of the 2012 Review Conference, which would consider whether to recommend the convening of a further open-ended meeting of governmental experts, the Secretary-General would submit updated financial implications through established procedures at a later stage.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, 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, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, 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 Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Mexico

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32 was adopted by 167 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

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

I would first like to inform members that, while we have some minutes left, at the end of the meeting we will need to adopt the Committee's programme of work and timetable for 2011. I therefore ask representatives to limit their statements to a minimum.

Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Cuba voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32* on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects, in line with my country's ongoing full support for the United Nations Programme of Action on Small Arms, with whose provisions we comply strictly. In that regard, my country actively participated in the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States on Small Arms, submitting a large number of proposals that were reflected in the final documents adopted.

We underscore that paragraph 4 of the present draft refers to section IV, paragraph 23, of the final report of the Fourth Biennial Meeting (A/CONF.192/BMS/2010/3) in connection with the arbitrary procedure followed in adopting the final report of the Meeting, which cannot be a precedent for future meetings on the Programme of Action. Unlike what happened at the Fourth Biennial Meeting, we stress that the final documents of such meetings must be duly negotiated, in a transparent and inclusive way, with the participation of all delegations on an equal footing.

Cuba attaches the greatest importance to that reference to paragraph 23; in fact, the inclusion of that language is what made it possible for the final report of the Fourth Biennial Meeting to be adopted.

Mr. Rachmianto (Indonesia): I have asked for the floor to explain our vote on the amendments contained in document A/C.1/65/L.61, as well as on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*.

In our view, the original text of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*, submitted by South Africa, Japan and Colombia, was a balanced text that could preserve consensus. It is clear to my delegation that, under the United Nations Programme of Action, we fully recognize that there is an urgent need to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects at the national, subregional, regional and global levels.

Therefore, with reference to "in all its aspects" in the title of the draft resolution and in the title of the United Nations Programme of Action, in our interpretation this means that in dealing with the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, efforts should be made with regard not only to cross-border issues, but also to address other aspects within the borders of each sovereign State, such as national legislation, stockpiling and brokering, as well as marking and tracing.

We are fully aware that, under the Programme of Action, every State has committed itself, among other things, to make illicit arms production or possession a criminal offence, to establish a national coordination agency to identify and destroy stocks of surplus weapons, and to issue end-user certificates for the export or transit of small arms and light weapons.

However, taking into account the need for continued and vigorous efforts to fully implement the United Nations Programme of Action, we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*.

Mr. Seifi Pargou (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

Paragraph 4 of that draft resolution, on the report (A/CONF.192/BMS/2010/3) of the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action, does not reflect the fact that the report was prepared by the Chair of the Fourth Biennial Meeting, with the assistance of his friends, and submitted for adoption without negotiation. That fact, which is already reflected in the same report, has been neglected in the current draft resolution. Unfortunately, such a practice was also exercised by the Chair of the Third Biennial Meeting and continued by the Chair of the Fourth Biennial Meeting, which, in both cases, led to the destruction of consensus and the adoption of the draft resolution concerned through a vote.

Moreover, the report of the Fourth Biennial Meeting and the draft resolution also cover some specific areas that are exclusively within the competence of the Review Conference to be held in 2012.

Ms. Ally (Guyana): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 14 member States of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) in explanation of vote after the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*.

Today, CARICOM voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*, even though the region is of the view that it does not fully address all issues of critical importance to us. CARICOM will continue to be a conscience on that issue, which, for us and those that examine it, is cross-border in character. We will continue to use all forums available to us, such as the resumed Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty next February

and the Programme of Action, and will raise the issue again during next year's First Committee session.

We continue to reaffirm our commitment to the principles of multilateralism, but will not allow ourselves to fall victim to an issue that has an adverse impact on our socio-economic development and the lives of our citizens.

Mr. Arrocha (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.32*.

My delegation took the very difficult decision to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. We deeply regret that the inflexibility in the conduct of the negotiations did not allow for progress on the process and led to the adoption of a draft resolution that did not include the language agreed by consensus at the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States on Small Arms. The quest for consensus is therefore an issue that we should consider in the future.

However, our abstention does not imply in any way that Mexico has given up on its effort to ensure that the United Nations shows the necessary political will to appropriately and effectively prevent and combat the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. My delegation wishes to reiterate its full commitment to the Programme of Action and to point out that we will strive for a constructive and inclusive dialogue that will make it possible to prevent and combat the illicit trade in weapons, and thus save thousands of lives around the world.

The Chair: The Committee has thus completed action on this phase of its work.

I give the floor to the representative of Kazakhstan.

Mr. Tilegen (Kazakhstan): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.51, entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)", I would like to bring to your attention, Sir, and that of all delegations of the Committee, that the Treaty does not have a short name. It should therefore appear by its full name in the draft resolution. We request that all future resolutions on this subject, as well as all documents of the United Nations, carry the full name of that Treaty.

The Chair: That request is duly noted.

In accordance with the adopted programme of work, the last business of this session will be to adopt the programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2011, as contained in document A/C.1/65/CRP.4, which I believe has been distributed to all delegations.

As members will notice, this document is based on the practice of the Committee in previous years. The overall number of meetings during the specific stages of our work is the same as this year and last year. The only difference in the proposed programme is that the Committee will finish its work on Tuesday rather than on Monday, as has been the case to date — specifically, on 1 November 2011. The reason for the additional day is the following.

As all delegations are aware, the First Committee shares its conference facilities and other resources with the Fourth Committee. As such, the work programmes of the two Committees are closely coordinated. In the past, the First Committee had been given the courtesy of having two meetings on the last Friday, as we are doing today. As a result, we always had one additional meeting planned for Mondays on an as-needed basis.

The situation will be different next year, as the Fourth Committee cannot afford us an additional meeting on Friday evening. That means that this meeting will have to be compensated for during the following week. We already have a meeting planned for Monday morning and, due to the situation I have described, we must add another meeting on Tuesday. We count on the understanding and cooperation of delegations.

Are there any comments on document A/C.1/65/CRP.4 in that regard?

That not being the case, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for the 2011 as contained in A/C.1/65/CRP.4?

It was so decided.

Statement by the Chair

The Chair: Before I adjourn this meeting and close the 2010 session of the First Committee, allow me to offer some final remarks.

This year the Committee finished its work in four weeks, with 23 meetings; 107 delegations made statements within the general debate segment; and 98 delegations spoke within the thematic discussion format. During this session, the Committee adopted 55 draft resolutions and 3 decisions: 20 draft resolutions were adopted by a recorded vote and 35 draft resolutions and 3 decisions were adopted without a vote, which corresponds to 66 per cent of all action taken. This is a slight relative increase from last year's record of 55 per cent.

This session was held at an important juncture in time, when the long freeze that had gripped the disarmament agenda was just starting to ease. The First Committee at the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly had to meet the expectations and legitimate aspirations of our peoples, who wish to see the disarmament community advance their security interests and move forward the disarmament agenda as an inseparable part of the common endeavour to promote security and stability in the various regions and around the world as a whole.

We discussed and addressed the urgency of nuclear disarmament, the priority of nuclear non-proliferation, the need to continue strengthening the chemical and biological weapons prohibition regime and the importance of reducing conventional arms and considering means towards the regulation of their trade. We underlined the potential, value and need to revitalize the United Nations disarmament machinery and addressed outer space disarmament aspects and many other crucially important issues for the security of humankind.

Over the past four weeks, I have had the honour of chairing this body, the challenge of effectively addressing a diverse, extensive and important agenda and the privilege of dealing with every member to collectively bring our session to a successful conclusion. We have deliberated frankly, engaged constructively and exchanged views in an atmosphere of mutual respect and understanding. We did not see eye to eye on all the issues on our agenda or all the draft resolutions we took action on; yet we come out of this session understanding each other's views better and knowing even more that further work is required to bring our views closer if we seriously want to move forward.

I wish to express once again my gratitude to all members for giving me the opportunity to chair the 2010 session of the First Committee and share with you this challenging, yet rewarding, experience. I thank each and every delegation for their constructive spirit, cooperation and support, which I felt at every stage of this journey. Without your dedication and genuine commitment, the tasks at hand would have been truly difficult.

Special thanks go to the members of the Bureau and the Secretary of the Committee, along with his team. Their invaluable advice and counsel was a source of encouragement throughout the session. I also extend my deep gratitude to the High Representative for Disarmament, Mr. Sergio Duarte, and his highly motivated professional staff for their much appreciated assistance.

Let me pay well deserved tribute to interpreters, précis writers and conference officers, who reliably and tirelessly worked with us during the long hours of this session in a manner that I can only applaud and appreciate on behalf of the Committee.

On that note, let me conclude my remarks by wishing all those who are leaving a safe trip back home. I look forward to continuing to work with delegations in building further on our success here today and advancing our collective objectives towards a safer and more secure world for all.

Mr. Škrabalo (Croatia): I take the floor in my capacity as the Chair of the Group of Eastern European States. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you, Sir, for your exemplary leadership, as well as your team in the Bureau of the Committee for its hard work throughout this year's session of the First Committee. I am particularly pleased that a Chair from the Group of Eastern European States has presided over the first session of the Committee held in the new United Nations premises and using the new technical system of voting.

Our appreciation also goes to the Secretary of the Committee, the Office of Disarmament Affairs and the staff of the Secretariat, including the interpreters and other conference service officers, whose patience and understanding greatly help in our work. In addition, I would like to thank all countries for their constructive deliberations over the past few weeks. Finally, I wish a safe flight to all our colleagues who have come from their capitals and from Geneva and Vienna.

Mr. Obisakin (Nigeria): I take the floor on behalf of the African Group to thank you very much, Sir, for a job well done. We appreciate all your efforts. Africa thanks you, the Secretariat and all our colleagues.

We have spoken from our minds; some have spoken from their brains. Whichever is the case, the world still remains the same. In Africa we say that no matter how well you know how to swagger, swing and march, your head must still shake on your neck. There is no perfection in humankind.

I also want to thank our colleagues who came from all over the world and are returning home. We wish them a safe journey. We will meet and see them again. We part to meet, we meet to part.

The Chair: I declare the main part of the 2010 session of the First Committee closed.

The meeting was adjourned at 6.20 p.m.