



State. In urging India to do so promptly and without conditions, the draft resolution moves away from the practice of not referring by name to States not party to a treaty. It thus negates customary international law, as enshrined in the Vienna Law of Treaties, which lays down that no legal obligation can be imposed on a country without its sovereign consent. It is also in marked deviation from the resolution adopted last year, which removed many of the prescriptive suggestions that were not central to the main objective of the resolution.

Our objections to the final document of the 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the NPT are well known. We shall therefore be constrained to vote against the draft resolution.

**Ms. Mtshali** (South Africa): I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the partners of the New Agenda Coalition — Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Sweden and my own country, South Africa — to explain the New Agenda's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28\*\*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", that was submitted by Japan this year.

The New Agenda Coalition believes that the First Committee must send a strong message in pursuit of the objective of a nuclear-weapon-free world. That is particularly relevant in view of the failure of the 2005 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to achieve any substantive outcome, as well as the inability of the recently concluded General Assembly High-level Plenary Meeting to reach agreement on matters relating to nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. The sixtieth anniversary of the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki further underscores the need for renewed determination to realize the vision of a nuclear-weapon-free world.

A need exists for greater coherence and determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In that context, and without prejudging our future position, the States members of the New Agenda Coalition will vote in favour of the Japanese draft resolution, notwithstanding our preference that it contain stronger references to practical steps for nuclear disarmament and the unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals, as agreed upon at the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

**Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): In addition to the explanation of vote made by the representative of South Africa on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28, our delegation would like to add some elements that contributed to our changing our voting intention on the draft resolution this year.

At the outset, I extend my thanks to the delegation of Japan for its positive work on the draft resolution and for taking into consideration the many issues whose amendment we urged.

Despite the fact that the draft resolution does not fulfil all our wishes, and given the fact that its adoption coincides with the sixtieth anniversary of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and our keen interest in the total elimination of nuclear weapons on this occasion, as well as in solidarity with Japan, and in emphasis of Egypt's political priorities on this core issue, we have decided to abandon our abstentions of past years to a vote in favour of the draft resolution this year.

In that connection, Egypt does not objectively oppose the strengthening of the safeguards regime or the contents of the Additional Protocol. However, we have reservations concerning the international community's focus on generalizing the issue because

proliferation. We must try our best to ensure that such a lack of consensus does not erode the existing disarmament and non-proliferation regimes, and for that purpose it is essential that all Member States solidify their efforts to promote disarmament and non-proliferation.

safeguards agreement, which provides for verification standards well beyond those embodied in the Pelindaba Treaty. Spain is also pleased to contribute to the IAEA-

paragraph 3, which we later withdrew in order to preserve consensus on an issue of such importance to

Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia,

36orSwitz.2(nds)-5.8.9(, dssian)Tga,.5(a,)9( Ecuadan)TT,jLkistan.0172 Tc0.5229 Tw(Bruti, Ho)Thai, 74tug30eng

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Australia, Belarus, Bhutan, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

*Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4 was adopted by 144 votes to 5, with 19 abstentions.*

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28. A recorded vote has been requested.

**The Secretary:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Japan at the 20th meeting on 26 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.28 and A/C.1/60/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Niger, Uzbekistan and Germany.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea,





**Mr. Prasad** (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution entitled “Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, as contained in document A/C.1/60/L.28.

India fully supports the basic intent of the draft resolution, the total elimination of nuclear weapons. We agree that the ultimate objective of States is general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, as contained in the final document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We very much appreciate Japan’s commitment to this goal. However, we find that the draft resolution incorporates elements that are not acceptable to us. We cannot, for instance, accept a call to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Thus, while we agree with the basic objective of the draft resolution, that is, the global elimination of nuclear weapons, we are constrained to vote against the draft resolution.

**Mr. Vasiliev** (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to speak in explanation of vote A/C.1/60/L.4, entitled “Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments”. We wish to acknowledge the efforts of States of the New Agenda Coalition for their preparation this year of the text of the draft resolution on the question of nuclear disarmament that would be more acceptable to all States. The text was substantively reworked and shortened. We take note of its specifically positive dynamic. The draft resolution contains fundamentally important provisions that Russia shares. In particular, these refer to the importance of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the commitment to non-proliferation.

Nevertheless, we abstained in the vote. The first reason for that is the title of the draft resolution. The issue is raised here of an artificial acceleration of nuclear disarmament which does not take into account political, technical and financial restrictions. The Russian Federation is committed to its obligations under article 6 of the NPT. Moreover, we believe that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is possible only through a gradual, staged progress towards the ultimate goal, on the basis of a comprehensive approach, without artificially racing ahead, with the participation of all nuclear States and, naturally, in

circumstances where strategic stability and compliance with the principle of equal security for all are retained.

The second reason for our abstention is found in the sixth preambular paragraph, which contains the words “lack of implementation of binding obligations and agreed steps toward nuclear disarmament”. It is hard for us to agree with such an assessment of Russia’s real, major and irreversible practical steps towards reducing nuclear weapons in accordance with existing commitments.

**Mr. Atieh** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation has asked for the floor to



to the maintenance and reinforcement of international peace, security and stability, taking

**The Chairman:** The Committee will move to cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”.

**Mr. Freeman** (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union on

contribution to existing national, bilateral and regional efforts to control the proliferation of small arms and light weapons, which so heavily taxes the human and financial resources of the region. Such an instrument should have been based on firm obligations so as to enable States to trace existing lines of supply of illegal weapons, prevent the creation of new lines of supply and prevent the diversion of weapons from the legal trade, thus providing effective controls to curtail the spread and use of small arms and light weapons.

**Ms. Vatne** (Norway): Norway would like to align itself with the views expressed in the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Union on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55, entitled “International instrument to enable States to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons”.

**The Chairman:** As no other delegation wishes to take the floor, I will now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of position before action is taken on the draft resolution.

**Mr. Loedel** (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): The States members of MERCOSUR — Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay — and associated States Bolivia, Chile, Columbia, Ecuador, Peru and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would like to explain their position before action is taken on the draft decision. The following countries also fully associate themselves with this statement: Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama.

During the meetings of the Open-ended Working Group to Negotiate an International Instrument to

arms. That is the case of the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and, within our region, Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials (CIFTA), which all MERCOSUR member and associated countries, as well as those countries that endorse this statement, have signed and ratified.

Our countries will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, because that abstention conforms to our commitment to seek an effective, timely and legally binding international instrument, as well as with our efforts towards comprehensive and effective implementation of the agreement reached in last June's negotiations on marking and tracing, to which the countries of our region gave their consensus support. MERCOSUR and associated countries recognize that the provisions on how to undertake marking, the maintenance of registries and cooperation in tracing contained in the marking and tracing instrument are compatible with the obligations of our countries as States parties to CIFTA.

In that regard, our countries reaffirm their commitment to pursue the efforts necessary to conclude a legally binding international instrument that, in an effective, timely and reliable manner, deals with the issue of the marking and the tracing of

the representative of Uruguay took the floor and made an explanation of vote before the vote. The delegation of Mexico also requested the floor to make an explanation of vote before the vote. I do not think that there was any doubt that we had concluded the stage of general statements.

It is not the intention of Mexico to prevent any delegation from taking the floor. Mr. Chairman, if you allow the delegation of Japan to speak, after clarifying that it did not have the right to do so, Mexico will not oppose that decision.

**The Chairman:** The procedure is rather complicated. As delegations know, we have at least four stages. The first is that of general statement and the introduction of draft resolutions. Next are explanations of vote before the vote, voting and explanations of vote after the vote.

From now on, once we have concluded a phase and there is a speaker speaking in the next phase, I will not allow any delegation to speak under the previous phase.

The delegation of Japan has already started its statement. It can finish as a final exception.

**Mr. Mine (Japan):** With regard to the particular paragraph put to the vote, operative paragraph 2, I would like to remind all delegations that the paragraph calls upon all States to implement an international instrument on marking and tracing.

I am aware that there would be a kind of dissatisfaction among certain countries, especially vis-à-vis the nature of that instrument. However, in that connection, I would like to point out the following two points.

First, negotiations on the draft instrument were concluded by consensus in the working group last June; it was not through a vote. There was no objection against consensus adoption of the draft instrument.

Secondly, regardless of the nature of

In the context of the process of consultations and negotiations on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, Mexico suggested including an appeal to States in paragraph 2 to implement all — and I emphasize all — relevant instruments, particularly those binding in nature, above and beyond what has been agreed recently. That suggestion reflected a de facto situation, namely, that there are other binding instruments at both the regional and international level that address this issue.

Unfortunately, the amendments proposed in that



---

Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Z7(eMa(enia,)TJT\*067s0 Tc0 TZimbabwe(17)BT6TT2 1 Tf11.2073 0 0 10 M.

**Mr. Cynkin** (United States of America): In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, my delegation wishes to reiterate its strongly held view that all delegations should have adequate notice of draft resolutions that generate oral statements with regard to resource implications, prior to their consideration on the floor. As we have all affirmed previously, our concern for the transparent management and funding of First Committee initiatives is paramount. We respectfully request that the oral statement read out by the Secretary be issued in writing. We also request a postponement of the vote, in order to study the technical aspects of the statement that has just been read out as well as to study the possible financial implications of the draft resolution.

**The Chairman:** The representative of the United States has made two requests. The first is that the oral statement be made available as soon as possible, which we can do. As soon as we receive the oral statement from the appropriate department, we shall make it available to any delegation on request. I take it that satisfies the first request of the representative of the United States.

couple of other technical points that may be helpful in clarifying the situation.

First, it is my understanding that the rules of procedure of the General Assembly allow for any delegation to request information about programme budget implications. We are not requesting such information, as we are interested in moving things along as efficiently as possible. My understanding is that there is a requirement that 48 hours must transpire after requests for information about programme budget implications are made by delegations before the Committee can take action. We are asking for something less than that. But we think one thing is very important, namely, the question of oral statements on programme budget implications.

I do not think that such oral statements are mentioned in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. It is therefore difficult to address how they should be handled. I would therefore respectfully suggest that oral statements on programme budget implications be excluded, that, while this is the practice, they are not really appropriate at this time. Rather, we should focus on how we do our business most efficiently and effectively.

I thank the representative of Mexico for the reference to the need to behave in a humane manner towards each other. I agree completely. We certainly could have made our request at the beginning of the Committee's consideration of t.ve madssheatreq.,2(ve mad- e)-4.1()1.5(anding)-0.1(w ws)0.1(r b7e in -1.1976utu(u)-0.1



San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland,



will be able to return to the path of consensus on this issue. We call upon each of them to work in that direction.

**Mr. Kucer** (Slovakia): My delegation would like to request a correction to document A/C.1/60/INF/2, in which Slovakia is listed as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57. Slovakia did not sponsor that draft resolution.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will move on to cluster 5, “Regional disarmament and security”.

The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.19. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Stoute** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.19 is entitled “Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace”. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement at the Committee’s 14th meeting on 18 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.19.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

of the United Nations or of the mechanisms established by the treaties themselves, so as to preserve the collective security system enshrined in their constitutive charters.

Unfortunately, the hopes for peace, stability and cooperation in the world that the creation of the United Nations inspired are far from being realized. The current situation in the areas of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation clearly reflects the crisis of multilateralism at the global level.

Cuba will continue to support, and to be directly involved in, negotiations in the context of existing major multilateral instruments and international organizations in the area of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation. Those instruments, which rely on verification mechanisms that are non-discriminatory and are designed to foster consultation and cooperation among the parties with a view to resolving disputes, facilitate compliance with obligations and provide disincentives for any resort to unilateral measures that violate the principles of international law and the Charter.

**Mr. Vasiliev** (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to introduce a revised draft resolution — A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1 — entitled “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”.

First of all, we are grateful to delegations for their support of the Russian draft resolution. During discussions in the First Committee, proposals were made for some small revisions to operative paragraph 1.

The purpose of that was to avoid potential ambiguities with regard to the fact that confidence-building measures in space could affect the legitimate interests of the users of spacecraft. We did not in any way mean to imply such an effect. However, in order to provide additional clarity vis-à-vis our intentions, we have agreed to the amendments considered desirable by our partners.

It is precisely to those ends that we put forth draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1. The problem of



Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, 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, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq,

Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, 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, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

United States of America

*Abstaining:*

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.15 was adopted by 167 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.*

**The Chairman:** I shall now call on representatives wishing to explain their positions after the voting.

**Mr. Meyer** (Canada): I have taken the floor on behalf of Australia, Canada and New Zealand to explain our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.14.

We once again wish to express our disappointment that the draft resolution does not take into account concerns that we and others share. We have demonstrated firm and long-standing support for multilateralism across the diplomatic spectrum, and we agree that multilateralism is a core principle in non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament. We also

A/C.1/60/L.15 and its predecessors have not generated progress towards resolving the issues its sponsors wish to address. For that reason, and because of our continuing reservations about the appropriateness and utility of this draft resolution, the United States voted “no”.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now move on to the last cluster for today: cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”.

The floor is now open for delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions.

**Mr. Cynkin** (United States of America): I do wish to make a statement, but I would first raise a point of information. For the sake of clarification, is it now the ruling of the Chair that this would be the appropriate time for my delegation to request — as we have previously done along similar lines — that any oral statements regarding financial implications of any draft resolution in this cluster be submitted in advance for our consideration? Or is there a better or more appropriate time when I will not be out of order in making such a statement? I note that I would have to guess which draft resolutions to be considered will generate such statements, but I am willing to take that chance.

**The Chairman:** The voting process has not yet started, so I think the representative of the United States can proceed.

**Mr. Cynkin** (United States of America): I hope you understand, Mr. Chairman, that my remarks are in no way meant to demonstrate any disrespect for you or for the hardworking members of the Secretariat. They are directed only at the situation in which we find ourselves.

Under this cluster — although it has not been officially announced in any way — it is our expectation that draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.18 and A/C.1/60/L.41 may generate oral statements regarding programme budget implications. In that connection, I wish to state again that my delegation wishes to reiterate its strongly held view that all delegations should have adequate notice of draft resolutions that generate oral statements with regard to resource implications, prior to their consideration on the floor.

To reiterate further, as we have all affirmed previously, our concern is for the transparent

management and funding of First Committee initiatives. That is paramount. We therefore respectfully request that, should they be offered with regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.18 or A/C.1/60/L.41, oral statements be issued in writing. If that is the case, we also request that there be a postponement of the vote on those two draft resolutions, in order to enable members to study the technical aspects of the statement that would be read, as well as the possible financial implications of those draft resolutions, should they indeed produce oral statements.

**The Chairman:** The representative of the United States has requested that the Committee defer its action on draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.18 and A/C.1/60/L.41. Are there any objections to that request?

That not being the case, the Committee will defer its action on those two draft resolutions. We shall therefore consider only draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17 at this time.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Stoute** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17, which is entitled “Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee’s 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.17.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft decision without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** A number of delegations have asked for the floor, and I shall call on them now.

**Mr. Freeman** (United Kingdom): I simply wish to make a very short comment, if I may. I fully respect what the Chairman said on the question raised earlier with regard to oral statements on financial issues. But could I, just from the point of view of my delegation,

recall that it does seem to me, as a very practical person from a very practical country, that we are creating a rather daft situation, in which delegations now have to anticipate whether there will be oral statements. They have to anticipate what those oral statements say, but they must express their views in advance of their being presented. It seems to me an extraordinarily daft situation to have created.

I do not mean any disrespect to you, Mr. Chairman, for I know you do not wish to create it, but I do think that the legal advisers and others should perhaps reflect a little upon the sense of creating a situation in which this is going to continue to happen.

**The Chairman:** I call on the representative of the

A/C.1/60/L.49, A/C.1/60/L.16 and A/C.1/60/L.29, plus A/C.1/60/L.18 and A/C.1/60/L.41 — we must still take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.22, A/C.1/60/L.62, A/C.1/60/L.38, A/C.1/60/L.33, A/C.1/60/L.37, A/C.1/60/L.56, A/C.1/60/L.1, A/C.1/60/L.35 and A/C.1/60/L.39.

**Mr. Freeman** (United Kingdom): Just for clarification, is what you have just read out, Mr. Chairman, everything we are going to take up on Friday, or everything that is left? I am not being difficult: I just think that otherwise we are going to be slightly confused as to what exactly we are doing on Friday and what we are doing on Monday.

**The Chairman:** The list I have read out is not exhaustive. There are still outstanding draft resolutions with which we must deal.

**Mr. Vasiliev** (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): In order to avoid questions on Friday, I should like to inform members that, as I already mentioned today, Russia's draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1 will be ready for action on Friday. The Secretariat has informed us that the revised draft resolution will be issued either this evening or tomorrow morning. Delegations will therefore have sufficient time to review it in accordance with the 24-hour rule. We will therefore be able to act on it at Friday's meeting, as agreed.

*The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.*