In the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful

Mr. Chairman,

I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation on the draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.49/Rev.1 entitled “Preventing and Combating Illicit Brokering Activities”.

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

However, the notion of illicit brokering in Weapons of Mass Destruction which is wrongly reflected in this resolution implies that there is a “licit trade in Weapons of Mass Destruction.” Under major international conventions on Weapons of Mass Destruction, the production, development, research, transfer and use of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons are prohibited and undoubtedly their trade or brokering is illegal as well.

Accordingly, the only interpretation of some paragraphs contained in this resolution could be that the transfer of such inhumane weapons from a possessor State to Non-possessor States is legal. While, for instance in the case of the NPT, the transfer of nuclear weapons from a nuclear weapon State to non-nuclear weapon States is legally prohibited and illegal.
While appreciating and sharing the views of main sponsor of the draft resolution on the need to prevent and combat the illicit brokering in small arms and light weapons and the importance of preventing the terrorist groups to have access to the WMD, which is a valid concern, the Committee has already dealt with it in other resolutions. Furthermore, we are of the view that, logically and methodologically, it is inappropriate to mix these two completely different concepts since the field of small arms and light weapons is totally different from the field of WMD.

Moreover, the resolution lacks a focused approach, as has been requested in many occasions by the General Assembly, and its adoption in its current form, may lead to an interpretation which is detrimental to the letter and spirit of major international conventions on the WMD.

We have consulted with the sponsor of the draft resolution and constructively proposed some amendments in order to enable us to join the consensus on this resolution as we did last time. While appreciating the delegation of the Republic of Korea for trying to consider these amendments, unfortunately, it could not accommodate our major concerns and there still exists substantive problem with the draft.

For instance, a part of this draft resolution recognizes, though implicitly, non-transparent and exclusive export control regimes, such as the “Australia Group”, which were not negotiated or agreed within the UN and only serve political objectives of certain States by hampering international cooperation.

For the above mentioned reasons, my delegation will vote in abstention on the draft resolution.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.