



General Assembly

Seventy-second session

First Committee

27th meeting

Wednesday, 1 November 2017, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Bahr Aluloom (Iraq)

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Agenda items 52 (b) and 90 to 106 (continued)

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

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): Before we begin the meeting, I would like to express my condolences for yesterday's terrorist attack in New York. We strongly condemn the aggressive act of terrorism against this great city and its generous people. We stand in full solidarity with the Government and the people of New York and the United States, and on behalf of the First Committee we condemn and denounce these acts. We would like to express our full solidarity with the family of the victims and to wish the injured a speedy recovery. And we would like to express our condolences to Belgium and Argentina and our full solidarity with them as well.

(*spoke in English*)

This afternoon, the Committee will be guided by the ground rules on action on all draft proposals for reference. After that, time permitting, we will consider the draft provisional programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2018, as contained in document A/C.1/72/CRP/6, and hear a brief statement by Mrs. Izumi Nakamitsu, the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs.

We will begin by listening to the remaining delegations that have requested the floor for explanations of vote or position on cluster 5, "Other disarmament

measures and international security", but that did not get the opportunity to speak by the time we adjourned yesterday. Altogether, we have six delegations waiting to take the floor — France, Iran, India, the Syrian Arab Republic, Singapore and the Russian Federation. The Committee will now hear from them, after which we will take up the draft resolutions and decisions contained in informal paper A/C.1/72/INF/4.

Mr. Riquet (France) (*spoke in French*): I too would like to begin by expressing France's sorrow and solidarity in the wake of the tragic events that took place yesterday right here in New York. Of course, our thoughts and condolences go to the victims and their families. France stands beside the United States and the American people in such tragic circumstances. Our fight for freedom brings us closer together than ever.

I would like to deliver an explanation of position on behalf of the United Kingdom and France on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.30, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". The United Kingdom and France joined the consensus on this draft resolution. We support the mainstreaming of disarmament issues in development policy, particularly in the areas of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons, and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. That said, we feel it necessary to make our position clear on other aspects of the text.

First, we find the notion of a symbiotic relationship between disarmament and development questionable, since the conditions conducive to disarmament do not necessarily depend solely on development, as we have seen in some developing countries' growing

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in 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-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

17-35813 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



military expenditures. The two are not automatically linked but rather have a complex relationship that this notion does not sufficiently capture. Moreover, the idea according to which military expenditure directly diverts funding from development requires a more nuanced consideration, to the extent that defence investments are also necessary for maintaining peace, improving responses to natural disasters — I am thinking of airborne and maritime equipment in particular — and, under certain conditions, for strengthening stability. Lastly, in our view the Group of Governmental Experts to Review the Operation and Further Development of the United Nations Report on Military Expenditures did not give sufficient credit to unilateral, bilateral and multilateral actions in disarmament and non-proliferation.

I would now like to explain the position of the United Kingdom and France on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.31, “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”, on which we joined the consensus. However, we would like to make it clear that our countries operate under stringent domestic environmental-impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms-control and disarmament agreements. Unlike the draft resolution, we see no direct connection between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control.

Climate change is one of the most serious challenges facing our world. It poses a threat to the environment, to global security and to economic prosperity. In that respect, the United Kingdom and France are firmly committed to combating climate change. In that regard, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Paris Climate Change Agreement represent our common road map for transforming our economies and our energy models. We reaffirm our commitment to the full implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement, as well as to ramping up our efforts in order to live up to our ambitions and responsibilities for future generations.

Mr. Al Habib (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.52/Rev.1, entitled “Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament”.

We acknowledge that international transfers of dual-use and high-technology products, services and

know-how for peaceful purposes are very important to the socioeconomic development of all societies, particularly developing countries. At the same time, we share the view that certain military applications of scientific and technological developments can help to develop weapons of mass destruction. While we therefore believe that it is essential to facilitate and ensure international transfers of dual-use and high-technology products, services and know-how for peaceful purposes as fully as possible, it is also important to regulate transfers of such products where there are reasonable grounds to believe that they might be used for developing weapons of mass destruction. That requires striking a delicate balance between ensuring respect for the inherent right of every State to participate as fully as possible in the exchange of dual-use and high-technology products, services and know-how for peaceful purposes, and preventing their use in developing weapons of mass destruction. That can have a serious and unavoidable impact on the socioeconomic and security interests of many States, particularly developing countries.

In regulating such transfers, therefore, the concerns and interests of all States, particularly their legitimate defence requirements, must be taken into account. That can be ensured only through an inclusive and transparent process involving the participation of all States and leading to the development of a set of multilaterally negotiated, universally acceptable, non-discriminatory guidelines. It is on the basis of that perspective that the Islamic Republic of Iran shares developing countries’ concerns about the growing proliferation of ad hoc and exclusive export-control regimes and arrangements for dual-use goods and technologies that circumvent the inherent rights of developing countries and are likely to impede their socioeconomic development. Unfortunately, despite the efforts of its main sponsor, draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.52/Rev.1, in its current form, lags far behind our perspective and expectations. In fact, the latest version of this resolution was adopted in 2006.

However, in order to demonstrate our good will, my delegation went against its usual practice by joining the consensus on the draft resolution this year, in hopes that it will be reconsidered next year and put back on the right track. If our expectations are not fulfilled and our concerns addressed next year, we will reconsider our position on the resolution.

Ms. Bhandari (India): India stands by the Government and the people of the United States of America following yesterday's incidents in New York. We would like to express our deep condolences to the families of the victims and we wish the injured a speedy recovery.

With regard to our explanation of vote, India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, as we believe in the responsibility of States to fully comply with their obligations under the various disarmament, non-proliferation and arms-limitation agreements to which they are party. States' commitments, including other agreed-on obligations, also arise from obligations that States have undertaken voluntarily and in exercise of their sovereignty.

We believe that in encouraging compliance by other States with disarmament, non-proliferation and arms-limitation agreements to which a State is party or in pursuing appropriate ideas of cooperation so as to increase confidence and compliance, that State should act in accordance with the compliance mechanisms and other provisions in the relevant agreements and in a manner consistent with the Charter of the United Nations and international law. Similarly, States should also resolve any issues related to a State's compliance with its obligations regarding disarmament, non-proliferation and arms-limitation agreements to which it is a party, in accordance with the compliance mechanisms provided in the relevant agreements and in a manner consistent with the Charter and international law. We would also like to emphasize the important of multilateralism in addressing issues that may arise in relation to non-proliferation, arms-limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments".

We would like to explain our vote. First, compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments is very important. While we have stressed that importance and agree with it, that compliance, first and foremost, also entails complying with the international agreements that regulate non-proliferation, especially the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which is something that many of those voting in favour of the

draft resolution — especially NATO countries — not only do not respect but even blatantly violate.

Secondly, while the draft resolution calls for compliance with nuclear-non-proliferation, arms-limitation and disarmament agreements, Israel — the only entity possessing nuclear weapons in the Middle East — refuses to accede to the NPT. Its nuclear arsenal is a threat to peace and security in the Middle East and the rest of the world, and yet it is one of the countries that voted in favour of the draft resolution. This raises the question of whether the draft resolution is really credible, especially considering that it calls on all countries to hold countries that do not comply with those commitments accountable. As Committee members are no doubt aware, Israel is one of those countries. In spite of all that, many countries in the Organization turn a blind eye to this violation by Israel.

Thirdly, the draft resolution did not even mention the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which is absurd.

Ms. Goh (Singapore): Singapore stands by the Government and the people of the United States following yesterday's horrific terrorist attack. We express our condolences and send our thoughts to the families of those who lost their loved ones.

I am explaining my delegation's vote on draft decision A/C.1/72/L.44, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". Singapore regrets that the latest iteration of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security could not agree on a substantive report, despite its Chair's best efforts. However, we want to reaffirm the importance of the work and reports of the Group's previous iterations. In particular, we support the adoption of voluntary norms of behaviour as a guide to the responsible use of information and communications technologies. Such norms should be implemented and universalized. A coherent and coordinated global effort is key to ensuring a trusted and resilient cyberenvironment.

As a small and highly connected State, Singapore supports a secure and resilient cyberspace, underpinned by international law, well-defined norms of responsible behaviour on the part of States and coordinated capacity-building efforts to meet those norms. Robust international cooperation is necessary to address the

emerging challenges posed by cyberthreats. In that regard, Singapore is of the view that the United Nations should continue to play a central role in addressing challenges related to the use of information and communications technologies. With the inclusion of the agenda item in the provisional agenda for the seventy-third session, we should take stock of the work that has been done and carefully consider the way forward. The path ahead must be open, inclusive and based on consensus.

Much was achieved in the previous reports of the Group of Governmental Experts. We should not lose momentum in those important discussions. We should continue our discussions in the United Nations in order to promote greater understanding of the issue, bridge differences of opinion and strengthen existing norms. Singapore will continue to engage constructively in the process and will work with others to come up with practical approaches and solutions to address cybersecurity challenges.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): At the outset, I would like to express our deepest sympathies to our American partners and, through them, to all the residents of New York, as well as to those of other cities and other foreign States who fell victim to yesterday's tragedy. Such sad events emphasize yet again how fragile our world is and how essential it is that we all stand together in dealing with real issues and challenges.

I now have some comments to make on the motives behind the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, on the issue of compliance with agreements. To be frank, we are somewhat puzzled by the circumstances surrounding it. We are not so bothered by the text itself, which is drearily correct. The fact that agreements should be complied with is entirely obvious, and one would think that it would not require additional resolutions. Hence the question. Why is the author once again promoting a draft resolution like this? That is where the problems lie.

We have great respect for the position of any State on issues related to compliance with agreements, especially that of a partner as important and influential as the author of this draft resolution. But there is no need for deviousness, and certainly not for politicization. We can just look at the bare facts. The author of the draft resolution was the initiator of the agreement on the Treaty between the United States of

America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems in 1972 — a fundamental treaty in the area of control of strategic weapons, without which no progress towards a nuclear-weapon-free world is possible. At the time, we supported them in that undertaking. However, in 2002, the author of this draft resolution withdrew unilaterally from that crucial treaty, sending the unmistakable message that in its view, we would not be building a nuclear-weapon-free world in the foreseeable future.

Moving on, in 1972, the author of this draft resolution was one of the initiators of the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC), and we supported it in that, too. Time passes, and suddenly, in 2000, the author of this draft resolution unilaterally undermines the multilateral efforts — which were a done deal — on a legally binding protocol to the Convention, and essentially blocks all further multilateral substantive work within the framework of the BWC. And we all saw that same destructive position re-emerge in November during last year's Review Conference of the BWC.

Moving on again, in 1996, at the initiative of the same author of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty was adopted. We supported that endeavour as well. And yet, two decades later, we now see that its own author does not intend even to ratify it.

Continuing to move on, in 1997 the Chemical Weapons Convention was adopted on the initiative of the author of this draft resolution, and on top of that, with its stubborn insistence on extremely ambitious deadlines for destroying chemical weapons, which essentially forced us all to consent to meeting them by 2007. And what do we see now, in 2017? Almost all of us have complied with our obligations under the Convention and yet the author of this draft resolution still possesses massive stockpiles of such weapons.

It is interesting that a completely different picture emerges when we, Russia and China, propose a 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. In this case, a tidal wave of criticism is unleashed against us, claiming that we are virtually destroying international security when what we are proposing is ending the possibility of an arms race in outer space once and for all. Moreover, the author of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7 is requiring all of its allies to, at the very least, refrain from working

on the issue of preventing an arms race in outer space, despite the fact that the subject is said to be one of its national priorities. It was a strange moment when, a few days ago here in the First Committee, the author of the draft resolution called on all States to reject our joint initiative on preventing an arms race in outer space, in what it would seem was confusion about both the place and the time. All of us here are participating in the seventy-second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, not in a closed meeting of NATO's nuclear planning committee. Our job is to work to achieve compromises in the area of arms control, not to call for its obstruction.

I want to emphasize once again that these are simply the facts, and they are not politicized in any way. It is also noteworthy that the author of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7 publishes an annual national report on issues of compliance with agreements. Strangely enough, for some reason the report says nothing about these facts, while many others are cited with no evidence whatever and a number of States are surprised to find themselves regularly mentioned. Of course, any State is entitled to publish national reports about anything it wants, but why bring all of that before the First Committee? All of us here are educated, well-prepared experts, acquainted with the true facts relating to compliance agreements, not to mention perfectly aware as to where the facts are supported and where they are being manipulated for political reasons.

I repeat, we have great respect for every State's approach to the issue of compliance with agreements, and we have no intention of criticizing anyone in that regard, let alone accusing someone without foundation. We rely on nothing but clear, undisputed facts, which is why we fail to understand why the author of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7 allowed itself to be exposed to such criticism. In our view, that is not sound behaviour.

The Chair: We have heard from the last speaker in explanation of vote or position on cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

The Committee will now turn to informal paper 4, beginning with cluster 6, "Regional disarmament and security". I shall first give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or introduce draft resolutions. Delegations are reminded that general statements are limited to five minutes.

Mr. Riquet (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to make a brief general statement before the vote on cluster 6, "Regional disarmament and security".

As indicated in the explanation of vote made by the United States on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.6, France will vote against any resolution that explicitly references the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, adopted on 7 July, which France opposes. I am referring specifically to First Committee draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.6, A/C.1/72/L.17, A/C.1/72/L.18, A/C.1/72/L.19, A/C.1/72/L.28, A/C.1/72/L.45 and A/C.1/72/L.57.

I would also like to note that France will continue to comment on various draft resolutions that have changed little this year, for the same reasons that we have done so in the past. Nevertheless, we reject any interpretation of their texts that indicates any links with the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, particularly with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.8, in this cluster.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the observer of the European Union.

Ms. Kemppainen (European Union): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU). The candidate countries Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Albania; the country of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the European Free Trade Association countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia, align themselves with this statement.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.8, "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", the EU would like to state the following.

We take note of the draft resolution's paragraph 5, which has been revised in order to maintain consensus on this important draft resolution. It calls on all States of the Mediterranean region that have not yet done so to adhere to all the multilaterally negotiated legal instruments in force related to the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, thus creating the conditions necessary for strengthening peace and cooperation in the region.

We would like to underline that the proposed reference to legal instruments in force does not imply a change to our long-standing position in support of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), which has yet to enter into force. Promoting the CTBT's universalization and early entry into force is among the EU's top priorities. All 28 EU member States have ratified the Treaty and remain strongly committed to reaching its objectives. A proposal is currently under consideration for EU Ministers to continue the EU's substantial financial support to the CTBT. The EU reiterates its call to all States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the CTBT without any preconditions or delay. That call is particularly addressed to the eight remaining annex 2 States, since their ratification is essential to the Treaty's entry into force. Until it enters into force, we call on all States to maintain moratoriums on nuclear-weapon-test explosions and other nuclear explosions, and to refrain from any actions that would undermine the Treaty's objectives and purpose. In that regard, we strongly condemn the nuclear tests carried out by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which are illegal under multiple Security Council resolutions.

Nuclear-weapon-test and all other nuclear explosions represent a serious threat to international peace and security, and undermine the global non-proliferation regime. The European Union will continue its strong support to the CTBT and its organizations, as well as the strengthening of its monitoring and verification capabilities. It is important to ensure that all State signatories adhere to the Treaty's objectives. Nonetheless, as long as the CTBT has not entered into force, on-site inspections, an important verification tool, cannot be used. Only its entry into force can verifiably outlaw nuclear-weapon-test and other nuclear explosions. We will therefore continue to take every opportunity to advocate the Treaty's ratification and universalization during this session of the First Committee.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan, who will introduce an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.13/Rev.1.

Mr. Saeed (Pakistan): I have requested the floor to introduce an oral amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.13/Rev.1, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels". The oral revision was posted on the e-Delegate portal of the First Committee on 25 October and proposes changes to the

fourth preambular paragraph, which would now read as follows:

"Aware that the preservation of a balance in the defence capabilities of States at the lowest level of armaments would contribute to peace and stability and should be a prime objective of conventional arms control",

after deleting the phrase "as well as to creating a community of shared future for humankind". With this oral revision, the draft resolution has been reverted to its original version, published as document A/C.1/72/L.13, dated 9 October 2017 and, barring a few technical updates, has become identical to the resolution adopted last year by the General Assembly as resolution 71/41. We seek the continued cooperation and understanding of all delegations in that regard. We also take this opportunity to once again ask for the valuable support of all States for this important draft resolution, which addresses the important issue of conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels in order to promote and contribute to regional and international peace, security and stability.

The Chair: The Committee will now hear delegations wishing to explain their position before we take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 6, "Regional disarmament and security". Statements are limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. Bakhshi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.8, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

My delegation will not participate in the Committee's action on that draft resolution, given the continued crisis in the occupied territories of Palestine and the Israeli regime's imposition of a brutally severe blockade on the people of Gaza, including from the Mediterranean side. The draft resolution does not reflect the facts of the situation in the occupied territories and is therefore far from responding to reality in the region.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft proposals under cluster 6, entitled "Regional disarmament and security".

We shall first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.8, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.8 was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.8.

The main sponsors have informed us of the circulation of a revision to paragraph 5, which reads as follows.

"Calls upon all States of the Mediterranean region that have not yet done so to adhere to all the multilaterally negotiated legal instruments in force related to the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, thus creating the conditions necessary for strengthening peace and cooperation in the region".

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.8 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.8, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.11, entitled "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.11 was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.11. In addition to that, the Maldives has also become a sponsor.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.11 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.11 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.12, entitled "Regional disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.12 was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.12.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.12 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.12 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.13/Rev.1, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.13/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.13/Rev.1.

The main sponsors have informed us of the following oral revision to the fourth preambular paragraph of the text, which reads as follows:

"Aware that the preservation of a balance in the defence capabilities of States at the lowest level of armaments would contribute to peace and stability and should be a prime objective of conventional arms control".

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea,

Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bhutan, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 131 votes to 1, with 38 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.13/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana,

Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, 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, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.13/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 174 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.29, entitled “Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.29 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 19th meeting, on 23 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.29.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.29 was adopted by 126 votes to 3, with 45 abstentions.

The Chair: I now call on the representative of India, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of vote after the voting.

Ms. Bhandari (India): India voted against draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.13/Rev.1, entitled “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels” and its paragraph 2, which requests the Conference on Disarmament to consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control. As the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, the Conference on Disarmament has a vocation of negotiating disarmament instruments of global application. In 1993, the United Nations Disarmament Commission adopted guidelines and recommendations for regional disarmament by consensus. There is therefore no need for the Conference on Disarmament to engage in formulating principles on the same subject at a time when it has several other priority issues on its agenda. Furthermore, we believe that States’ security concerns extend beyond narrowly defined regions. Consequently, the notion of a preservation of balance in defence capabilities in the regional or subregional context is both unrealistic and unacceptable to my delegation.

The Chair: We have heard the only speaker in explanation of vote after the voting on the draft resolutions under cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security”.

The Committee will now turn to cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”. I shall first give the floor

to speakers who wish to make general statements or introduce draft resolutions or decisions. Delegations are reminded that general statements are limited to five minutes.

I now give the floor to the representative of Belarus to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.9.

Mr. Tozik (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): At the outset, I would like to express our condolences to the citizens of the United States and the other countries involved in connection with the tragedy that occurred yesterday in New York.

The delegation of Belarus strives to draw the attention of the international community to the issue of new forms of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. We want to draw attention to that issue both within the framework of the work of the Conference on Disarmament and outside it. We also strive to draw the attention of the international community to potential threats and legal problems related to the issue, and to the quest for ways to solve and address them.

The development of scientific and technological progress and achievements in technology, improvements in the means of delivery of weapons, the potential for doing harm through the use of weapons of mass destruction and the growing role of non-State actors are all factors that demonstrate the importance of substantive discussions in the framework of the Conference on Disarmament, with the goal of identifying potential legal gaps and ways to close them preventively. The theme of new forms of weapons of mass destruction is regularly discussed in the Conference. During this year's session, relevant in-depth discussions were held within the Working Group of the Conference on the Way Ahead, co-facilitated by the delegation of Belarus, on improving the internationally recognized procedures that can enable the monitoring of situations where new forms of weapons of mass destruction may be being developed and setting up conditions for formulating specific recommendations on certain types of such weapons that could be manufactured.

Every three years we introduce the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament" (A/C.1/72/L.9). The draft resolution is aimed at advancing the idea of preventing an arms race and establishing a disarmament mechanism that

could be activated if necessary. It includes a political commitment by Member States to reaffirming their determination to prevent the emergence of new forms of weapons of mass destruction and provides for the adoption of a mechanism for response readiness through the Conference on Disarmament to keep the situation under review and draft recommendations on specific negotiations on new forms of weapons of mass destruction. I should point out that the draft resolution is still relevant and its updating is exclusively technical. We firmly believe that the current international situation, the increasing numbers of threats and the importance of responding to them, together with the compromise-based nature of the draft resolution, will enable us to achieve a consensus on it. We call on all States to support the draft resolution and we affirm our readiness to cooperate further on the issue with all States, without exception.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Peru to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.51.

Mr. Prieto (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): Peru expresses its heartfelt condolences to the families of the victims of the cowardly attack in New York and reiterates its complete rejection of the use of violence and terror.

As it does every year, my delegation is taking the floor to introduce, on behalf of the 33 States that make up the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, this year's version of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.51, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean". This year my country was again called on to facilitate the draft resolution on the Regional Centre, based in Lima, which refers to the activities of the Centre for the period from July 2016 to June 2017. In that regard, it highlights the Regional Centre's important role and the support it provides to States in the region in advancing a series of initiatives and activities aimed at implementing peace and disarmament measures, as well as promoting their economic and social development through the appropriate reuse of available resources. The Centre organized activities and provided technical, legal and policy assistance in order to help Latin American and the Caribbean States, at their request, implement international instruments relating to conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction and promote the participation of women in disarmament, arms-control and non-proliferation

initiatives, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 65/69.

Finally, my delegation would like to thank the Member States and other partners who have supported the Centre's operations and programmes through their contributions, both financial and in kind, and we call on all countries to continue making generous contributions. We also reiterate our firm support to the role of the Centre as a promoter of the activities of the United Nations at the regional level to strengthen peace, stability, security and development. That is why we trust that we can count on the invaluable support of all delegations to ensure that the draft resolution is adopted by consensus, as in previous years.

Ms. Jenie (Indonesia): We would like to express our sincere condolences to the Government and the people of the United States and to send our thoughts and prayers to all of those affected by yesterday's incident.

The Open-ended Working Group on the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament convened three times during 2016 and 2017 with the positive and active participation of many delegations, including some that had abstained in previous decisions or resolutions on the subject. Although there were differences of opinion expressed during the discussions, the Working Group was able to agree on language that was acceptable to all. The fact that it was able to agree by consensus on recommendations for the special session's objectives and agenda underlines the commitment of all delegations to multilateralism, shows that there is a willingness to achieve progress and gives hope for the future of discourse on disarmament.

It will therefore be important to keep this positive momentum and continue consultations with all delegations to determine, by common agreement and in line with the consensus reached in the Working Group, the best possible way forward on this issue. Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.33, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament", was submitted in that spirit. We will continue to work with optimism on this endeavour and we look forward to consulting with all Member States to make the convening of the fourth special session devoted to disarmament a reality.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Nepal to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.48.

Mr. Bhattarai (Nepal): At the outset, we would like to express our heartfelt condolences to the Government and the people of the United States for the loss of life in yesterday's cowardly act of terrorism.

I thank you, Mr. Chair, for giving me the floor to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.48, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", under sub-item (d) of agenda item 100. The sponsors of the draft resolution are Afghanistan, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, the Maldives, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Vanuatu, Viet Nam and my own country, Nepal.

My delegation is sincerely grateful to all the sponsors. We believe that the regional and global approaches to disarmament and non-proliferation complement one another and should be pursued simultaneously in order to promote regional and international peace and security. In that belief, Nepal has been a strong advocate of the important role of regional disarmament in maintaining international peace and security through disarmament and non-proliferation. Our efforts for peace and disarmament will further flourish if complemented with a regional approach based on confidence-building. Only ongoing dialogues and exchanges of views can help to bolster confidence and create an environment conducive to making further progress in regional peace and disarmament.

In that regard, we appreciate the activities of the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific aimed at promoting regional discussions on important disarmament issues by building a renewed sense of confidence and understanding among Member States. As the host country of the Regional Centre, Nepal is committed to giving its full support to enhancing the Centre's constructive role by consolidating the Kathmandu Process. The Regional Centre's programmes are conducted using resources generated from voluntary contributions, which should be further enhanced. I would like to take this opportunity to express Nepal's sincere appreciation to the Member States that have continued to support the Centre, including through voluntary contributions to its programmes and activities. We are confident that more Member States will lend their support to expanding

and enriching the Centre's activities in the course of promoting peace and stability in the region and beyond.

In that context, my delegation has the honour to introduce to the First Committee, on behalf of the sponsor, draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.48, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", with some updates on the Centre's work over the past year. Apart from some technical updates to the previous year's draft resolution, two new preambular paragraphs, the seventh and eighth, have been added to acknowledge the Centre's contribution in support of achieving the Sustainable Development Goals and promoting the role and representation of women in disarmament, non-proliferation and arms-control activities. Additionally, an oral revision was made to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution and circulated to Member States by the Secretary of the Committee last week. Other than that oral revision, the text of the document remains exactly the same as that of General Assembly resolution 71/78. We are confident that, as in previous years, we will have the valuable support of all delegations for the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.

Mr. Bakhshi (Islamic Republic of Iran): Iran attaches great importance to multilateralism as the core principle of negotiations in the field of disarmament. In that context, we would like to emphasize the vital importance and continued validity of the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery, established at the first special session devoted to disarmament. Based on their existing working methods and rules of procedure and the rule of consensus in particular, the Conference on Disarmament (CD) and the United Nations Disarmament Commission have formulated landmark universal instruments in the past, proving the relevance of their mandate and the efficiency and effectiveness of their rules of procedure. Calling United Nations disarmament machinery ineffective is merely a way to shift the blame. As we have said time and again, in the absence of genuine political will, even the best of our disarmament machinery cannot possibly be effective. The only solution to the current problems with the United Nations disarmament machinery, therefore, is for certain nuclear-weapon States and their partners to demonstrate genuine political will in that regard.

We reaffirm the important role of the CD as the sole multilateral negotiation body on disarmament and the importance and relevance of the Disarmament Commission as the sole specialized deliberative body on

disarmament, as well as the First Committee's valuable contribution to global deliberations on disarmament and international security. Revitalizing the existing United Nations disarmament machinery is a shared objective and a common responsibility, particularly in regard to nuclear disarmament, and is one of the highest priorities of the international community of States.

In that context, we strongly support the commencement of negotiations in the CD on a comprehensive nuclear-weapon convention as soon as possible, as the Assembly has urged for years. My delegation supports the position of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries on the strict application of the principle of equitable geographical distribution in the composition of the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs and the groups of governmental experts in the fields of disarmament and international security, and urges the Secretary-General to take concrete action to achieve that.

We continue to strongly support the significant role of the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament in training young diplomats in the field of disarmament, which we consider a valuable contribution to professionalism in disarmament forums.

The Chair: The Committee will now hear from the delegation wishing to explain its position before we take action on the draft proposals listed under cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

Mrs. García Guiza (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to express my heartfelt condolences to the families of the victims of yesterday's tragic event in this city.

My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.14, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". As a member of the Conference on Disarmament, Mexico joins the consensus on the draft resolution, given the importance of the Conference as the only permanent forum mandated to negotiate multilateral disarmament agreements. In our firm belief in the vital importance of collective disarmament and arms control and in line with my country's consistent and well-known position on the unacceptable situation in the Conference on Disarmament, I would like to make the following points.

Mexico is concerned about and displeased with the stagnation in the Conference, which has lasted more than two decades. In draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.14,

those who have benefited from the prevailing impasse have tried to gloss over the clear problems that the Conference is facing and have thereby contributed to the lack of progress in disarmament and arms control. In Mexico's view, welcoming the decision establishing the Working Group on the Way Ahead and its results demands an in-depth evaluation of the Conference's utility and accomplishments. The similar groups that have been set up over the past five years have shown that doing things this way produces no tangible results. In every case, practice has shown that this is a method that merely simulates progress — that is to say, substantive work.

Mexico supported the proposal for eliminating value judgments from draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.14 regarding the discussions held during the Conference's 2017 session in order to arrive at a draft resolution that includes a factual description of what has truly gone on in that forum. The purpose was to avoid qualifying what occurred in the absence of consensus on the usefulness or value of certain groups, such as the Working Group on the Way Ahead, in the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mexico has said frankly that if the Conference on Disarmament is not adequate to the situation, the resources currently allocated to it should be redistributed to other categories in the United Nations system such as sustainable development. The situation in the Conference on Disarmament is unacceptable and unsustainable. Mexico will therefore continue to oppose the promotion of actions within the Conference that fall outside its explicit mandate. As far as we are concerned, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.14 represents no change at all in our position on the regrettable situation that we are witnessing in the Conference on Disarmament.

The Chair: We have heard the only speaker in explanation of position before the voting on cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft proposals under cluster 7, entitled "Disarmament machinery".

We shall first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.9, entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.9 was introduced by the representative of Belarus at today's meeting of the Committee. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.9.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, 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 Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan,

Tuvalu, Uganda, 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:

Israel, Ukraine, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.9 was adopted by 173 votes to 3.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.14, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.14 was introduced by the representative of Spain at the Committee’s 23rd meeting, on 26 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.14.

In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.14, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to ensure and to strengthen, if needed, the provision to the Conference on Disarmament of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services. It is recalled that the resources for the substantive and Secretariat support of the Conference on Disarmament are included under section 4, “Disarmament”, and that the resources for conference servicing are included under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management”, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

Subject to decisions taken at the 2018 session of the Conference on Disarmament to establish its programme of work for 2018 and to establish any subsidiary body for its implementation, the strengthening of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services to the Conference, as requested in paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, may entail additional resource requirements under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019. The established procedures on the preparation of a statement of programme budget

implications would be followed, as necessary, in the context of actions to be taken by the Conference on Disarmament. Accordingly, at this time, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.14 would not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.14 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.20, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.20 was introduced by the representative of Cameroon, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Economic Community of Central African States, at the 21st meeting of the Committee, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.20.

The main sponsors have informed the Bureau of a revision to paragraph 20 of the text, which now reads as follows:

“Requests the Security Council to consider strengthening the mandate of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic in order to reinforce and support the internal security forces and the defence forces of the Central African Republic in coordination with the European Union Training Mission in the Central African Republic in their efforts to stabilize the country, including in the east, in the context of combating the Lord’s Resistance Army and other armed groups.”

In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 8 of A/C.1/72/L.20, the General Assembly would call on the Secretary-General to convene the first Conference of States parties to the Central African Convention for the

Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons, Their Ammunition and All Parts and Components That Can Be Used for Their Manufacture, Repair and Assembly, in accordance with article 34, paragraph 3, of the Kinshasa Convention, and requests States parties to inform it of the logistical details, including the venue of the meeting, the composition of the Bureau and the source of funding for the meeting. The implementation of the request contained in paragraph 8 of the draft resolution would be carried out within resources to be provided by the States parties to the Central African Convention for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons, Their Ammunition and All Parts and Components That Can Be Used for Their Manufacture, Repair and Assembly, the Kinshasa Convention. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.20, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

In addition to the sponsors already listed, Gabon has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.20.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.20 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.20, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.25, entitled “Report of the Disarmament Commission”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.25 was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the 23rd meeting of the Committee, on 26 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.25.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.25 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.25 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.33, entitled

“Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.33 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 22nd meeting of the Committee, on 25 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.33.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, 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, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

France, Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.33 was adopted by 170 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.34, entitled “United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.34 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 22nd meeting of the Committee, on 25 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.34.

I will now read an oral statement in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.34, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide all support necessary, within existing resources, to the regional centres in carrying out their programmes of activities. The implementation of the request contained in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019. Its provisions would cover 10 posts — three P-5 senior political affairs officers; three P-3 political affairs officers; and four General Service local-level posts for the regional centres, as well as the centres’ general operating costs. The programmes of activities

of the three regional centres would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.34, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section 6 of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the most recent being resolution 70/247, of 23 December 2015, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed the role of the Fifth Committee in carrying out a thorough analysis and approving human and financial resources and policies with a view to ensuring the full, effective and efficient implementation of all mandated programmes and activities and the implementation of policies in that regard.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.34 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.39, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.39 was submitted by the representative of Nigeria, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.39.

I will now read an oral statement in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 4 and 11 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.39, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to facilitate close cooperation between the Regional Centre and the African Union, in particular in the areas of disarmament,

peace and security, and requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Regional Centre with the support necessary for greater achievements and results. The implementation of the request contained in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019. Regarding paragraph 11, provisions under section 4, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019 would cover one P-5 senior political affairs officer, one P-3 political affairs officer and two General Service local-level posts, as well as general operating expenses. The programme of activities of the Regional Centre would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.39, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section 6 of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the most recent being resolution 70/247, of 23 December 2015, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed the role of the Fifth Committee in carrying out a thorough analysis and approving human and financial resources and policies, with a view to ensuring the full, effective and efficient implementation of all mandated programmes and activities and the implementation of policies in that regard.

In addition to the sponsors listed, the Maldives has also become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.39.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.39 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.39 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.48, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.48 was introduced by the representative of Nepal at the 21st meeting of the Committee, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.48.

The main sponsors have informed the Bureau of the following oral revision to paragraph 1, which should read as follows:

"Expresses its satisfaction at the activities carried out over the past year by the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific, and invites all States of the region to continue to support the activities of the Regional Centre, including by continuing to take part in them, where possible, and by proposing items for inclusion in the programme of activities of the Centre, in order to contribute to the implementation of measures for peace and disarmament".

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.48 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.48, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.51, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.51 was introduced by the representative of Peru, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, at the 21st meeting of the Committee, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.51.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.51 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.51 was adopted.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the delegation wishing to make a statement in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. Wood (United States): First let me thank you for your condolences, Mr. Chair, as well as the delegations that have also expressed their condolences for the terrorist attack that occurred yesterday in Manhattan. I would like to reassure everyone that the United States will not waver in its efforts to fight those who engage in extremism and terrorism.

I am taking the floor to explain the vote of the United States on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.9, entitled “Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament”. The United States believes that the international community should focus on the very real problem of the proliferation of known weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), both by States that wilfully violate their commitments to treaties and by non-State actors. In the 66 years since the 1948 definition of weapons of mass destruction was written, no new types of WMDs have appeared. The notion of new types of WMDs beyond chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear remains entirely hypothetical. No useful purpose is served by diverting the attention of the international community away from existing threats, and the United States therefore voted against draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.9.

The United States abstained in the voting on A/C.1/72/L.33, entitled “Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”. The United States participated in good faith in the Open-ended Working Group on the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in a signal of our commitment to the consensus-based disarmament machinery of the United Nations. The Working Group’s consensus agreement on the objectives and agenda for a fourth special session has been a long-sought goal and represents a positive outcome, proving that consensus can and does work if Member States are patient, persistent and realistic. That said, we remain deeply sceptical about the added value of a fourth special session, especially given the deep divisions among Member States on such fundamental concepts as the need to acknowledge and operate on the basis of the underlying international security environment when weighing the merits of disarmament efforts.

We also remain very concerned about the potential costs associated with a fourth special session, for which we have yet to see an approximate estimate from the Secretariat. And that is not the Secretariat’s fault. The Member State demandeurs for a special session should take the lead on the issue and act soon to facilitate more transparency on its full cost. In that regard, we continue to oppose the establishment of a preparatory committee for the special session, which would almost certainly drive up the overall price tag for this large international conference. Going forward, we intend to engage in discussions and decision-making on possible next steps for a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, bearing in mind our enduring significant reservations about it. For those reasons, the United States abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.33.

The Chair: We have heard from the only speaker in explanation of vote after the voting on cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on the remaining draft proposals under cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”. I shall first give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions under cluster 1. Delegations are reminded that general statements are limited to five minutes.

Ms. Sánchez Rodríguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation would like to reiterate its condolences to the Government and the people of the United States for the attack that occurred yesterday afternoon.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.45, “Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”, we would like to highlight the fact that this initiative of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries made possible our observance on 26 September every year of the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons and is now giving all of us the opportunity to participate in a high-level international United Nations conference on nuclear disarmament in 2018, with a view to reviewing the progress that has been made in that area. It is an opportunity that we must take advantage of to promote our shared objective of nuclear disarmament, making it possible for us to analyse the accomplishments we have made and the potential additional measures that could be adopted in order to mobilize international efforts to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world. We hope

that it will be successful and will enjoy the support and participation of all who are committed to nuclear disarmament and peace.

My delegation is of the view that draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.18, entitled “Nuclear disarmament”, is one of the most comprehensive proposals submitted to the Committee on nuclear disarmament, which must continue to be a top priority in the area of disarmament. The draft resolution indicates important themes with regard to the obligations and commitments related to the goal of nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons. It also welcomes the adoption of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, an instrument to which Cuba is honoured to be a signatory, and recognizes the establishment of Latin America and the Caribbean as a zone of peace, proclaimed at the Second Summit of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, held in Havana in 2014, at which the countries of the region reaffirmed their commitment to nuclear disarmament. We want to reiterate that the goal of nuclear disarmament cannot constantly be deferred and subjected to conditions. Rather, we need the commitment of nuclear-weapon States to enable us to halt the development of such weapons, take them away from non-nuclear-weapon States as soon as possible and destroy them in a verifiable and irreversible manner.

Cuba stresses the importance of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.57, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons”. The text affirms that the continued existence of nuclear weapons represents a threat to humankind and all life forms on Earth. It also notes that the only defence against a nuclear catastrophe is the total elimination of nuclear weapons and the certainty that they will never be produced again. The text reaffirms the determination of the international community to achieve the objective of a nuclear-weapon-free world through the total elimination of such weapons. It also underscores the unanimous decision of the International Court of Justice in 1996 that there exists an obligation to pursue and conclude in good faith negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects, under strict and effective international control. We reiterate that the only way of ensuring no use or threat of use of such weapons is their total elimination.

Mr. Saeed (Pakistan): My delegation has requested the floor to make a general statement on draft resolution

A/C.1/72/L.45/Rev.1. We fully support its objectives, which include starting negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a comprehensive nuclear-weapon convention. Pakistan has consistently supported the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world through the conclusion in the Conference on Disarmament of a universal, non-discriminatory and verifiable comprehensive nuclear-weapon convention, as recognized at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The objective of the process should be undiminished security at the lowest possible level of armaments and military forces.

We would like to recall here that Pakistan did not take part in the negotiations on the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, owing to its various glaring procedural and substantive shortcomings, which we have discussed on a number of occasions during this session.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions and a draft decision under cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”.

We will first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.18, entitled “Nuclear disarmament”.

I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.18 was introduced by the representative of the Myanmar at the Committee’s 12th meeting, on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.18.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on the thirty-second preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 16 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.18.

I shall first put to the vote the thirty-second preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia,

Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Belarus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Finland, India, Japan, Mauritius, Pakistan, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

The thirty-second preambular paragraph was retained by 114 votes to 37, with 11 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 16 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.18.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, 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, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Pakistan

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, Israel, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Operative paragraph 16 was retained by 159 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.18 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Ireland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Malta, New Zealand, Pakistan, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Serbia, South Africa, Sweden, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.18, as a whole, was adopted by 110 votes to 41, with 18 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.45/Rev.1 was submitted 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, on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.45/Rev.1.

A statement on the programme budget implications of this draft resolution has been issued as document A/C.1/72/L.59.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on the twelfth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.45/Rev.1.

I shall first put to the vote the twelfth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint

Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Georgia, Greece, Iceland, Japan, Norway, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

The twelfth preambular paragraph was retained by 123 votes to 26, with 17 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.45/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali,

Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Iceland, Japan, Norway, Portugal, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.45/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 129 votes to 30, with 12 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.57, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.57 was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the Committee's 23rd meeting, on 26 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.57. In addition to those already listed, Tuvalu and El Salvador have become sponsors.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on the sixteenth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.57.

I shall first put to the vote the sixteenth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Belarus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Finland, Georgia, India, Japan,

Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine

The sixteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 117 votes to 35, with 13 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.57.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of

Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Belarus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Finland, Georgia, India, Japan, Pakistan, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 117 votes to 35, with 14 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.57 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France,

Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Finland, Georgia, Iceland, India, Japan, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.57, as a whole, was adopted by 124 votes to 31, with 17 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/72/L.58, entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/72/L.58 was introduced by the representative of Philippines, on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the States parties to the Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.58.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/72/L.58 was adopted.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to delegations wishing to make statements in explanations of vote or position after adoption.

Ms. Stoeva (Bulgaria): I would like to express our deepest condolences to the Governments and the peoples of the United States, Argentina and Belgium for the terrible loss of life in yesterday's heinous terrorist attack in Manhattan.

I am speaking on behalf of Greece, Iceland, Norway, Portugal and my own country, Bulgaria. Last year, our delegations abstained in the voting on General Assembly resolution 71/71. Unfortunately, this

year we are not in a position to support draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.45/Rev.1 either. The concerns we expressed last year remain valid. We believe in a world free of nuclear weapons and consider disarmament and non-proliferation to be mutually reinforcing goals that should be pursued through successive and gradual steps, involving all nuclear-weapon States in the process.

We would like to stress the fundamental role that we believe the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) has to play as the cornerstone of the global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime and its complete implementation. While it is regrettable that the 2015 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was not able to achieve consensus in an outcome document, our efforts should be aimed at ensuring the success of the review cycle that commenced this year.

In that context, we continue to see the convening of another high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament in 2018, as outlined in the draft resolution, as parallel and likely to distract our focus from the NPT. We appreciate the reference to the NPT in the preamble to the draft resolution, but the emphasis is on only one of the pillars. In our view, nuclear disarmament is directly linked to the strengthening of the non-proliferation regime, and NPT obligations should therefore not be approached selectively. Achieving progress on these commonly shared goals requires the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the commencement of negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

We agree that the Conference on Disarmament (CD) should start substantive work as soon as possible. However, we do not see a nuclear-weapon convention as its first priority. Instead, we should aim at a comprehensive and balanced programme of work that includes the CD's four core issues. As was agreed on at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the CD should be the single negotiating body in disarmament affairs, and it is unclear to us whether a high-level international conference in 2018 might conflict with that consensus decision. We believe in a cooperative and inclusive approach in order to make real progress in nuclear disarmament.

Finally, we share the concerns about the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons. However, the

recently adopted Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons will not contribute to their elimination. Only by recognizing both the security and humanitarian dimensions of nuclear weapons will we be able to achieve our goal of a world free of such weapons.

Mr. Guelaye (Mauritania) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, on behalf of the Group of Arab States, I would like to express our heartfelt condolences to the Government and the people of the United States in the wake of yesterday's tragic event in Manhattan.

I would like to make the following statement in explanation of the vote of the Arab Group on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.18, "Nuclear disarmament". The Arab Group voted in favour of the draft resolution today, and we are committed to nuclear-disarmament efforts in order to rid the world of such weapons. We also condemn the policies of ethnic cleansing and the many violations of the rights of the Muslim minority in Rakhine state in Myanmar.

Mr. Wood (United States): I would like to deliver an explanation of vote on behalf of the United Kingdom, France and the United States on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.45/Rev.1, "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament".

We believe that nuclear proliferation and non-compliance by a few States with their respective non-proliferation obligations, as well as nuclear terrorism and the deterioration of the international security environment, constitute serious threats to international peace and security. Unfortunately, the draft resolution calling for the establishment of a high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament does not address those threats. Without halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons and addressing the deterioration in the overall international security environment, it will not be possible to create conditions conducive to further progress on nuclear disarmament. The only reference to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in the draft resolution is to the Treaty's article VI. That is insufficient, incidental and unbalanced. The NPT as a whole constitutes the cornerstone of the nuclear-non-proliferation regime and the basis for nuclear-disarmament efforts. Convening another conference to discuss nuclear disarmament in 2018 without consideration of all NPT obligations will lead to another futile outcome.

Furthermore, the draft resolution takes note of the adoption of the text of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. We strongly oppose that Treaty, which was negotiated and concluded without the participation of any of the nuclear-weapon States or any State that possesses nuclear weapons. Progress on the nuclear-disarmament agenda will be possible only through an inclusive, consensus-based process that takes into account the prevailing international security environment.

Finally, we note with concern the programme budget implication associated with the draft resolution. We challenge the suggestion that summary records are needed for the meetings, including the organizational meeting, a practice that has been discarded as unnecessarily costly in almost all forums. We also fail to see the need for the identified number of in-session documents.

Ms. Hallin (Sweden): I would first like to express our sincere condolences to the American people and those directly affected by yesterday's terror attack.

I am taking the floor for an explanation of vote by Sweden and Switzerland regarding draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.57, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons". Our delegations abstained in the separate vote on paragraph 2, owing to the new version of the paragraph. The language it contains could be interpreted to mean that multilateral nuclear-disarmament negotiations, in a general sense, could be undertaken under the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

It is our understanding that only negotiations on aspects directly relevant to its implementation should be undertaken under that Treaty. The General Assembly has established processes and bodies for multilateral disarmament negotiations, including on nuclear disarmament, and those decisions remain valid. In that context, I would like to emphasize that in our assessment of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, Sweden and Switzerland will pay particular attention to the issue of whether the Treaty complements and reinforces existing instruments, bodies and processes. Interpretation of the Treaty by States parties to ensure that the consideration is met would constitute a positive signal.

Mr. Grant (Canada) (*spoke in French*): I would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.57,

"Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons".

Canada is firmly committed to nuclear disarmament. It is one of our long-standing goals. We continue to promote a pragmatic and gradual approach to nuclear disarmament that includes nuclear- and non-nuclear-weapon States alike and is designed to achieve concrete results. Canada has long believed that disarmament is a political rather than a legal issue. We have therefore abstained in the voting on this annual resolution for many years. It does not acknowledge the fact that multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament must consider the broader global security context. Moreover, the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice do not carry the weight of international law, and in our view, a draft resolution cannot be used to implement such opinions.

(*spoke in English*)

Canada also has serious and long-standing reservations regarding the recently negotiated Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, which does not have the support of any nuclear-weapon State. That being said, we share the sentiment motivating the Treaty, which is that progress on nuclear disarmament has been too slow. In support of a pragmatic and collaborative approach to nuclear disarmament, we are leading a United Nations high-level group, endorsed by an overwhelming majority of countries, that is preparing the way for a fissile material cut-off treaty to help halt the production of nuclear weapons. We believe that this step-by-step approach is the most effective way forward on nuclear disarmament. We need all States to work in unison if our goal is achieving effective, verifiable and irreversible nuclear disarmament to which our countries are fully committed. For those reasons, we abstained on the draft resolution rather than voting in favour of it. Neither did we support the sixteenth preambular paragraph or paragraph 2, which refer to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, and on both of which we voted no.

Mr. Perren (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, I would also like to express my condolences to the people and the Government of the United States for yesterday's attacks in New York.

I am taking the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly

on nuclear disarmament". Since it was first introduced, in 2013, Switzerland has always voted in favour of this resolution. While we once again affirm that vote, we have some comments on the draft resolution. Switzerland firmly believes that it is essential to have additional effective measures and legal instruments that align with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, as the cornerstone of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, if we are to achieve and maintain a world free of nuclear weapons.

The exchanges that took place at the 2013 high-level conference, and the discussions and developments that ensued, have shown that there are several possible approaches to making progress towards that goal and that we have yet to agree on the next steps to be taken. We welcome the fact that the mandate of the high-level meeting to be held in 2018 will take those aspects into consideration. We hope that it can pave the way for an inclusive and broadly attended meeting, which will require an adequate and inclusive preparatory process. Switzerland hopes that the high-level meeting will be able to unite Member States around the common goal of nuclear disarmament, which will help to overcome the current polarization and identify subsequent steps that everyone can support.

Ms. Bhandari (India): I have asked for the floor to read out India's explanations of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.57 and A/C.1/72/L.18.

First, on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.57, "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons", India has traditionally been the only State possessing nuclear weapons to sponsor this resolution. We are disappointed that substantive changes have been made to its text this year. In particular, we are disappointed that the references have been dropped to the early conclusion of a nuclear-weapon convention based on the model nuclear-weapon convention submitted by the lead sponsors themselves. Furthermore, the substantive operational objective of the draft resolution, as reflected in paragraph 2, is no longer clear. My delegation has therefore felt obliged to withdraw its sponsorship and abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

Turning to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.18, "Nuclear disarmament", India considers nuclear disarmament to be the highest possible priority. We share the draft resolution's main objective, the complete elimination

of nuclear weapons within a specified timetable. We were nevertheless constrained to abstain in the voting on it because of certain references to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. India's position on both treaties is well known. However, our vote should not be seen as representing opposition to other provisions of the draft resolution, which we believe are consistent with the positions of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and India nationally on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. We commend Myanmar for retaining some vital principled paragraphs in the draft resolution that are supported by a vast majority.

Ms. Claringbould (Netherlands): The Netherlands would like to start by offering its condolences to the United States Government and the people of the United States for yesterday's attack right here in this city. Our thoughts are with the victims and their loved ones.

I would like to make this explanation of vote on behalf of the following countries: Albania, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey and my own country, the Netherlands. We would like to explain our vote against draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.45/Rev.1, "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament". All of us share the draft resolution's long-term goal of achieving and maintaining a world free of nuclear weapons. We all supported holding the high-level meeting on nuclear disarmament in 2013, and we all participated constructively in that meeting, discussing how to best achieve a world without nuclear weapons.

At the 2013 meeting, we made various proposals on how to reach that shared goal. We therefore regret that these have not been incorporated into the draft resolutions on the high-level meetings during the intervening years. Unfortunately, the draft resolution submitted this year does not address our concerns either. That leaves us with no choice but to once more voice our continuing concerns about the resolution.

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is the foundation of the international disarmament and non-proliferation regime. It is the international legal instrument that sets the framework for achieving and maintaining a nuclear-weapon-free

world. However, draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.45/Rev.1 does not include any clear references to the NPT. Moreover, it establishes the 2018 high-level international conference right after the second session of the NPT Preparatory Committee. It therefore fails to acknowledge the central role of the Treaty and its review cycle. NPT member States have affirmed by consensus that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. That is why we welcome the draft resolution's call to negotiate effective disarmament measures. However, since the proposals that were made at the 2013 high-level meeting and the concerns that we have raised subsequently have not been acknowledged in the draft resolution, we do not believe that the 2018 high-level international conference establishes the right mandate for such negotiations.

Mr. Saeed (Pakistan): I would like to present Pakistan's explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.18, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". My delegation supports several elements of the draft resolution, including the call for the establishment of an ad hoc committee in the Conference on Disarmament on nuclear disarmament, the conclusion of a legally binding instrument on negative security assurances and the importance of taking into account the security interests of all States while negotiating disarmament treaties.

However, as a non-party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we cannot subscribe to the implementation of the action plans and decisions of its Review Conferences. We have therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution. We have also been obliged to abstain in the voting on its thirty-second preambular paragraph. As we have noted on various occasions in this session, Pakistan did not take part in the negotiations for the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, given our reservations about what we see as its serious procedural and substantial shortcomings.

Paragraph 16 of the draft resolution calls for the immediate commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty on the basis of the mandate contained in document CD/1299. It is indeed ironic that a draft resolution on nuclear disarmament continues to promote only a treaty centred on the non-proliferation of fissile material. We therefore decided to vote against that paragraph.

Mr. Takamizawa (Japan): I would first like to express my deepest condolences to all those affected by yesterday's terrorist attack in lower Manhattan.

I would like to explain Japan's votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.57 and A/C.1/72/L.18. On A/C.1/72/L.57, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons", Japan abstained in the voting. Due to the immense destructive power and lethality of nuclear weapons, Japan believes that their use clearly does not conform to the spirit of humanitarianism that is the philosophical foundation of international law. The advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, as set out in the draft resolution, demonstrates the complexity of this issue. Japan supports the unanimous conclusion of the judges of the Court, which says that "there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament". On the other hand, we also believe that realistic measures are required if we are to achieve steady progress in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Moreover, while we agree with the need for multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament, they must be realized through the cooperation of nuclear- and non-nuclear-weapon States.

Although the approach of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons differs from ours, Japan does not deny that it includes various useful measures, including provisions for establishing legally binding frameworks for a world free of nuclear weapons. That basic stance informed our voting position. Following the same logic, Japan abstained in the voting on A/C.1/72/L.18, entitled "Nuclear disarmament."

In conclusion, in order to steadily implement concrete measures for nuclear disarmament, Japan attaches great importance to building mutual confidence through cooperation between nuclear- and non-nuclear-weapon States. I hope that clarifies our voting positions on those draft resolutions.

The Chair: We have heard from the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting on cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons".

I have received a request from the main sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.26/Rev.1 that action be postponed until tomorrow for further consultation. If the Committee agrees, we shall proceed accordingly.

I now call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My country's delegation has a request for the Secretary-General, which is that what was discussed regarding draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.26/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction" be circulated, particularly given the fact that paragraph 2 of the draft resolution mentions a report dated 26 October 2017. That report (S/2017/904, annex) has so far not been circulated, despite the fact that the draft resolution, as revised, was issued on 30 October and mentions the document. What sort of transparency is that? Did delegations expect that they would have to take action on a draft resolution that refers to a document that has not yet been issued? How can we circulate a draft resolution that mentions a report that has not yet been published? I certainly do not have a copy of it, and I would like to know how my colleagues were able to obtain one, and how they intend to vote on it. If the Secretariat has a copy of the report, we ask that it be circulated.

The Chair: I now call on the representative of the Russian Federation.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation has a constructive proposal. Given the fact that the author of the draft resolution in support of the Chemical Weapons Convention (A/C.1/72/L.26/Rev.1), traditionally adopted by consensus, has already managed to transform it into a confrontational document that is completely unacceptable to an ever-growing number of States, and moreover refuses to engage in any work on it with the delegations in the First Committee, we propose postponing its consideration until next year at the very least.

In our view, when a sponsor of a previously useful and consensus-based document obstinately attempts to introduce totally non-objective information into it, we can hardly expect the Committee to give it any constructive consideration. In general, we get the general impression that until our United States partners conclude their programme for eliminating chemical weapons — an initiative that we fully support and, incidentally, with respect to which consensus-based resolutions and decisions were adopted and taken under

the Convention — perhaps it makes no sense at all to consider such a resolution in the First Committee.

The Chair: I now call on the representative of Poland.

Mr. Broilo (Poland): I would first like to express our deepest condolences to the delegations of the United States, Argentina and Belgium for yesterday's heinous terrorist attack in lower Manhattan.

As the sole sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.26/Rev.1, "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction", we have done our utmost to ensure that it is as accurate and factual as possible. That is why we decided to present a revised version of it. Paragraph 2 of that version contains a reference to the conclusions of the newest report (S/2017/904, annex) of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons-United Nations Joint Investigative Mechanism (JIM). That report was sent to the members of the Security Council, along with a letter from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council (S/2017/904), so that it could be submitted to the members of the Security Council, including the incoming non-permanent members, of which Poland is one.

We are of the opinion that the conclusions of the latest JIM report are very important. They are too important to be omitted or put aside until December or, as suggested by the representative of the Russian Federation, until next year. That is why we decided to make them available to the members of the First Committee.

According to the information we received from the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, of which the Translation Service is part, the report will be available translated into all the official United Nations languages in a matter of hours. That is why we are requesting that action on the draft resolution be postponed until tomorrow.

The Chair: I now call on the representative of the United States.

Mr. Wood (United States): I will be very brief. Given the gravity of the crimes that have been committed in Syria through chemical-weapon attacks on the Syrian people, it would be absurd to put off any action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.26/Rev.1 until sometime next year. The United States cannot support the suggestion

that was just put forward by the representative of the Russian Federation.

The Chair: I now call on the representative of the Russian Federation.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Needless to say, we grasp the importance of all investigations into this matter. However, if we were to await an investigation into every such issue or crime committed — including the bombings of Yugoslavia, the invasion of Iraq, the bombing of Libya and even the still not investigated atomic bombing of Japan — we would not be able to do any work at all here.

Considering that the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons-United Nations Joint Investigative Mechanism (JIM) is submitting its report to the Security Council, we should allow the Security Council to consider the matter, which is not subject to the Chemical Weapons Convention. But what we had here was a draft resolution in support of the Chemical Weapons Convention. So let us try to draft a resolution that will serve to support it rather than plunge us into antagonistic disputes.

I repeat, the Polish delegation has refused to engage in any work with other delegations for the past two weeks. It has not responded to any constructive proposals for introducing amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.26/Rev.1. What is the sense in dragging out this pointless work until tomorrow in order for 190 States Members of the United Nations to listen to highly biased discussions on this issue? That is probably not why we are meeting here. Let us ask the Secretariat to consider this issue once more, objectively. Do we need to have this discussion in the First Committee or could we perhaps avoid any more confrontation? I would like to point out once again that we are here to consider issues that can truly help to foster international security. What the authors of the draft resolution are attempting to portray with it contradicts the aims of the First Committee.

The Chair: I now call on the representative of the United States.

Mr. Wood (United States): The representative of the Russian Federation is once again trying to deflect attention from the issue that we are all focused on, by calling for the issue to be taken up next year and for draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.26/Rev.1 to be rewritten. That is unacceptable. We should remember that

the Russian Federation has just vetoed the Security Council's renewal of the mandate of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons-United Nations Joint Investigative Mechanism. We are talking about a country that is enabling the regime in Damascus to carry out its attacks. If there is any confrontation on this matter, it is owing to the defence of the Syrian regime's ruthless behaviour towards its own people. It is unfortunate that it has to be that way, but we cannot continue to allow that kind of behaviour to occur in the twenty-first century. We therefore have an obligation to take up this issue, and my delegation once again firmly rejects any effort to defer this issue beyond tomorrow.

The Chair: I now call on the representative of Poland.

Mr. Broilo (Poland): I would like to briefly react to the statement by the representative of the Russian Federation and to underline that the consultation process for draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.26/Rev.1 was open and transparent from the very beginning. After conducting two open sessions of consultations in the past 10 days, we were ready and willing to consult with any delegation at any time.

The Chair: Given the late hour, we will continue this discussion tomorrow.

I now call on those delegations wishing to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. Wood (United States): I am taking the floor to exercise my right of reply, which should be no surprise to anyone in this room, given the remarks made earlier by the representative of the Russian Federation.

He wanted to know why the United States was putting forward draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.26/Rev.1. I will tell him why. We are putting it forward because the United States believes very strongly in the importance of complying with international obligations. Over the years, the United States has provided assistance to Governments to help them comply with their obligations under various treaties and conventions, and it will continue to do so. Our adherence to our obligations is unparalleled. Our colleague from the Russian Federation spoke about various issues on which he perceives the United States as having failed to comply with its obligations. I will address them without taking too much time.

The Russian representative mentioned the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of

Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (ABM Treaty). Paragraph 2 of article XV of the 1972 ABM Treaty gave each party the right to withdraw from the Treaty if it decided that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the Treaty had jeopardized its supreme interests. We have seen that between the time that the Treaty entered into force and the United States announced its intention to withdraw from the Treaty, on 13 December 2001, a number of State and non-State actors had acquired or were — and still are — actively seeking to acquire weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, a number of States are developing ballistic missiles, including long-range ballistic missiles, as a means of delivering weapons of mass destruction. It was clear then, and it remains clear today, that some of those entities are prepared to employ those weapons against the United States. As a result, the United States concluded that it must develop, test and deploy anti-ballistic-missile systems to defend its national territory, its forces outside the United States and its friends and allies. Pursuant to paragraph 2 of article XV, the United States therefore decided to exercise its right to withdraw from the Treaty.

The Russian delegation also referred to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. As I mentioned a few days ago, the United States has obviously not yet ratified that Treaty. There has been a very serious debate within my Government about the Treaty for quite some time — since it was signed, in fact. We are a democracy; we are not a country with one person in charge and a parliament that rubber-stamps agreements. That kind of debate in our country is very healthy and will continue.

I do not want to bore others by speaking about the Chemical Weapons Convention, as I addressed it a couple of days ago, but I would just remind everyone that we intend to complete the destruction of our chemical-weapon stockpiles by 2023. I would also like to note once again that the United States provided Russia with more than \$1 billion in assistance to enable it to carry out the destruction of its chemical-weapon stockpile.

As for the draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space, I have also touched on that issue, but I will say very briefly that it is a bad treaty whose time has not yet come.

I want to mention just a few more items. Since the Russian representative listed a number of areas where he saw non-compliance on the part of the United States,

I would like to mention a few areas where Russia should comply with its international obligations.

First and foremost, it should end the illegal and illegitimate annexation of Crimea, which we do not and will not recognize and which we call on Russia to reverse. Russia conducts large-scale snap exercises, contrary to the spirit of the 2011 Vienna Document of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and provocative military activities near NATO borders, including in the Baltic and Black Sea regions and the eastern Mediterranean. I also note its selective implementation of the Vienna Document and the Open Skies Treaty and its long-standing non-implementation of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, which have eroded the positive contributions of those arms-control instruments. Most notably, I should point to Russia's violation of its obligation, under the 1987 Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, not to possess, produce or flight-test a ground-launched cruise missile with a range capability between 500 and 5,500 kilometres. I do not think I need to say any more about how Russia has undercut the Budapest Memorandum, which my colleague from Ukraine so eloquently explained yesterday (see A/C.1/72/PV.26).

To sum up very briefly, those who live in glass houses, particularly very fragile ones, should not throw stones.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I have only 10 minutes, right? Given what was said by our United States partners, we would need at least a week to respond. But I will be brief.

First, with regard to the issue of Syria, which is indeed extremely important, Russia has a very serious attitude to everything that is going on on Syrian territory. Yes, we are helping the Syrian Government fight international terrorism. There has not been a single fact proving that the Syrian Government has used chemical weapons against its own population, and by extension against itself. It is basically absurd that the issue is even being considered. How cynical must one be to try to accuse the Syrian Government of such a thing, when it undertook to fully dismantle its chemical-weapon capabilities under the difficult conditions of fighting against terrorism? The efforts of our United States partners and the European Union to oust the Syrian Government forcibly have collapsed

in the total failure of that military and political plan. That is where all the insinuations that we are seeing in the Security Council and that are spilling into the First Committee are derived from, and they are undermining the consensus-based annual resolution in support of the Chemical Weapons Convention. This did not come from nowhere. An attempt to oust the Syrian Government failed, and it will continue to fail.

Regarding Russia's support of the Syrian Government, it is ultimately better to support effective, functioning Governments than to oust them, and to give the Syrian people the opportunity to determine for themselves who is legitimate in their eyes and who is not. A more valid question is to ask what American troops are doing on Syrian territory. Who summoned them? Russia, on the other hand, received an official request from the legitimate, functioning Government of Syria. So, yes, we are helping the Syrian Government to combat international terrorism. But what are the troops of America's great democracy doing there?

Do I have a few minutes left? I will continue until I am asked to end my statement and will then conclude immediately. The question of Crimea is extremely important to Russia. Crimea was, is and will continue to be a Russian territory. In a historical context, that question has been settled once and for all. We definitely do not care whether anyone in Washington likes that or not. For the United States, Crimea is merely a territory. For the Russian Federation, Crimea represents people who have lived in that territory for centuries. They are Russians, Ukrainians, Greeks, Turks, Armenians, Tatars and many others. None of them was happy about what our American and European Union partners did in Kyiv in 2014, when a bloody, unconstitutional coup was carried out at their instigation. Absolutely no one in the autonomous republic of Crimea wanted that. They decided for themselves that they could not live alongside the people in Kyiv who began slaughtering everyone indiscriminately.

The people of Crimea conducted a legitimate referendum on their territory because they were already an autonomous republic within the former State of Ukraine. They had their own parliament, and at a meeting of parliament they took the absolutely legitimate decision to conduct a referendum, through which they took the entirely legitimate decision to secede from Ukraine. Ninety-five per cent of the population of Crimea took part in the referendum, and 93 per cent of them voted in favour of secession from Kyiv's Nazist

regime. In the same referendum, they decided to ask Russia to allow them to return home. We responded by considering the issue in our own parliament and decided that we were indeed obliged to meet the demands of our own native peoples — Russians, Ukrainians, Greeks, Tatars, Armenians — who had settled that territory, and to allow them to return home. Any insinuations in that regard are totally unacceptable, and I repeat that we definitely do not care what Washington thinks about it.

The Chair: I have been informed that we have to release the interpreters now. We will therefore hear the remaining statements in right of reply in English only. I thank the interpreters for their time.

Mr. Leschenko (Ukraine): I am compelled to respond to the rhetoric of the representative of the Russian Federation. I would like to say that we totally reject the rhetoric about Crimea, and to note that the referendum was illegal and held with the support of Russian military forces. I would also like to recall resolution 68/262, adopted by the General Assembly in March 2014, which reaffirmed the territorial integrity of Ukraine. Additionally, General Assembly resolution 71/205, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol (Ukraine)", names the Russian Federation as an occupying Power and the autonomous republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol as the temporarily occupied territory of Ukraine.

I would like to take this opportunity to draw the Committee's attention to the statement that Mr. Sergey Lavrov, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, made in Moscow yesterday, on 31 October, at a conference devoted to the hundredth anniversary of the October 1917 socialist revolution in Russia, which, by the way, led to an unconstitutional and violent change of power in Russia and ultimately to a civil war and the creation of the Soviet Union. In speaking about the so-called Russian world, Mr. Lavrov stated that

"[o]ur country is not forcing anything on anyone and is not telling anyone how to live their lives. We believe that people around the world have the right ... to decide their fate for themselves."

We took positive note of that message and hope that the Russian Federation will very soon follow that important principle in practice rather than mere words.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic): I wanted to make my statement in right of reply in my own language of Arabic.

The Chair: If the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic wishes to speak in Arabic, it is up to him. I will devote myself completely to hearing him, but what about the floor?

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic): I am sure, Mr. Chair, that you will devote yourself to listening to me, since as our Chair you have led the Committee so well. I will make a few remarks anyway, even though I would prefer not to speak in English.

In connection with what was said by the representative of the United States Administration, we would like to point out that we have frequently urged him to read the notes prepared by his former Secretary of State, Mrs. Hillary Clinton, in which she declared that it was the United States Administration that created Al-Qaida, Da'esh and Al-Nusra. But it appears that our colleague is not interested in them. Nevertheless, our colleagues have seen them, and they constitute an official declaration, not just the opinion of a private individual.

Our friends and allies from the Russian Federation recently released aerial footage that shows American forces on Syrian territory exchanging locations with members of the Da'esh terrorist organization, without any fighting, of course. The footage is available to anyone who wants to see it. The lies and claims made by the United States representative are therefore futile, because the footage shows something completely different from what he has been proclaiming and claiming. We will never forget the fact that members of Da'esh were transported from one location to another by United States helicopters, even on your territory of Iraq, Mr. Chair. How many times have United States forces dropped weapons in places where Da'esh is located? A good number of times, in both Syria and Iraq, and not just once or even 10 times. There are a great many incidents in which Americans have dropped weapons and ammunition at places where Da'esh is present.

Finally, I would like to thank our colleague from the Russian Federation for his kind words about my country during his right of reply.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): I would just like to respond briefly to the remarks by the representative of the Syrian regime. It is absolutely,

positively ridiculous to suggest that the United States is arming Da'esh — absolutely ridiculous. It is the crimes of the regime in Damascus that have created Da'esh. That is the bottom line.

And to my Russian colleague, I want to say that despite Russia's protection of the Syrian regime, the international community will hold the regime accountable for its crimes against the Syrian people.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation): I am speaking English to please the friends I love from the Anglo-Saxon world. I love that language and I love my friends from the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and so forth.

We certainly have a lot of facts. Unfortunately, today is 1 November, not 2 October, or I could have told the Committee a lot of very interesting things. I should acknowledge that what our Syrian colleague has said is 100 per cent true and absolutely proven fact. We have all the necessary data, and we have presented all of it to the Security Council. At the moment it does in fact seem as if we are all in a meeting of the Security Council rather than the First Committee.

I also entirely agree with my American colleague that unfortunately there are a lot of ridiculous United States actions. Of course, we are discussing all of that bilaterally, and I do not want to bring that whole discussion in here. We can understand each other better on a bilateral basis.

I have one more thing to say, which is that I want to commend and pay tribute to my Ukrainian colleague. It was so nice to hear his marvellous Russian. It was so close to my heart. I thought to myself that this is truly the Ukraine that we love. That comes from our heart, our belief that Ukrainians and Russians are the same people. We were, we are and we will be together. Unfortunately, there are forces in the world that want to make Ukraine a rival of Russia. That will never happen.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic): At this late hour, I will be very brief. Whether the representative of the United States acknowledges it or not, the facts I mentioned were cited by an official, a former Secretary of State of the United States, who admitted that its Administration had created Da'esh, Al-Qaida and Al-Nusra. I do not suppose that everyone here knows that in the 1980s, when Al-Qaida was given \$600 million at its inception, one third of that was provided by the United States Administration and the other two thirds

by two Arab countries that I will not name now but will leave for another time.

No one will ever forget the lies that accompanied the invasion of Iraq, or that a couple of years later Colin Powell stated that he had been fooled by the lies invented to justify it. It resulted in more than 1 million widows and in the creation of Da'esh and Al-Nusra. All of that was caused by consecutive United States Administrations. So no matter how the United States representative tries to dodge the issue, he cannot. That is the reality; those are the facts. Everyone knows about it, and if he does not want to acknowledge it, that is his problem.

Mr. Rowland (United Kingdom): I am grateful to our Russian colleague for mentioning the United Kingdom, because there is something that I have wanted to say for a while now — since we began this debate, in fact. One of the reasons that the Security Council mandated the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons-United Nations Joint Investigative Mechanism was so that we would not have to depend on different perspectives and on politicized views of what is happening in Syria. One of the reasons that

the Security Council was unanimous in mandating the Joint Investigative Mechanism was so that we could have objective reporting on what had happened and objective attributions of the perpetrators of the use of chemical weapons in Syria.

No one denies the use of chemical weapons in Syria; the issue is who is using them. Given that the objective report (S/2017/904, annex) of the Joint Investigative Mechanism will be issued tomorrow to all Member States by 9 o'clock, I encourage all States to read the report before they come to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.26/Rev.1, on the Chemical Weapons Convention, and on the language that it draws on from that report.

Mr. Leschenko (Ukraine): I will be very brief. I would like to say that the sooner the Russian Federation withdraws its forces from our territory and returns it to Ukraine, the better that things will be for the Russian economy and the Russian people.

The Chair: We have exhausted the time available to us today.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.