



General Assembly

Sixty-ninth session

First Committee

20th meeting

Wednesday, 29 October 2014, 3 p.m.

New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Rattray (Jamaica)

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Statement by the Chair

The Chair: Permit me at the outset some brief remarks. I commend all representatives here present for ensuring that collectively they were able to organize themselves in such a fashion as to complete the last phase of our work on schedule. It is a credit to members. One or two people have congratulated the Chair and the Bureau, but I do not think it has much to do with the Chair and the Bureau. It has to do with the discipline and diligence of members in making sure that we ended the thematic segment on schedule, for which the Chair and the Bureau are highly appreciative.

Agenda items 87 to 104 (continued)

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

The Chair: In accordance with the programme of work, the First Committee will begin the third and final phase of its work this afternoon, namely, action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under agenda items 87 to 104. The Committee will be guided in that regard by informal papers to be issued by the Secretariat that will contain the draft resolutions and decisions on which action will be taken each day. Informal paper 1/Rev.1 has been circulated in the conference room, and we will first take action on the drafts under each cluster listed therein. The Secretariat will revise this informal paper on a daily basis in order to update the drafts that are ready for action at each of our remaining meetings.

Before we proceed, I propose that we follow the same procedures adopted by the Committee at previous sessions concerning the conduct of business during this action phase, that is to say, we will have the established four-step process of first making general statements under each cluster, followed by explanations of vote before action, thirdly action on the drafts and finally explanations of vote after action. On each cluster for any given day the Committee will first hear general statements. At the same time, delegations will have a final opportunity to introduce draft resolutions and decisions ready for action on that day, and I would kindly request that they be made as briefly as possible.

Next, delegations wishing to explain their positions on all the drafts under a cluster will have the opportunity to do so in a single intervention, before the Committee proceeds to take action on those drafts, one after the other and without any interruption in between. Pursuant to rule 128 of the rules of procedure

“After the Chairman has announced the beginning of voting, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting.”

In the case of a voting error, delegations wishing to register their original voting intention should not disrupt the voting process to request the correction by taking the floor. They should instead approach the Secretariat to clarify the original voting intention, which will be reflected in the official records.

Once the Committee completes action on all draft resolutions and decisions contained in a particular

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>).

14-59403 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



cluster listed in the day's informal paper, delegations preferring to explain their positions or votes after action is taken will also have the opportunity to do so. Similar to the consolidated explanations of vote before the vote, delegations are requested to make their explanations in one intervention. Also in accordance with rule 128 of the rules of procedure, sponsors of draft resolutions and decisions are not permitted to make any statements in explanation of vote either before or after action is taken. They will, however, be permitted to make general statements at the beginning of the consideration of the drafts under a given cluster.

Delegations seeking recorded votes on any draft resolution or decision are kindly requested to inform the Secretariat of their intention as early as possible, and before the day's meeting begins. All delegations wishing to postpone action on any draft are also requested to inform the Secretariat at least one day before action is scheduled to be taken on the draft in question. Nonetheless, I appeal to all delegations to make every effort to refrain from delaying action.

In order to ascertain that every delegation fully understands the process for the action phase, the Secretariat has prepared an information sheet, similar to the one that was circulated in previous years, regarding the ground rules for taking action on draft resolutions and decisions, and that has also been circulated in the room.

With members' full cooperation, I intend to follow the procedure that I have just explained in order to ensure the full and efficient utilization of the remaining time for this final stage of our work.

May I take it that the Committee wishes to proceed accordingly?

There being no objection, it was so decided.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions and decisions listed under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons", contained in informal paper 1/Rev.1 circulated in the conference room. Once we complete action on cluster 1 we will proceed to take action on the drafts listed under cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction", followed by the draft resolutions and decisions contained in the remaining clusters.

In accordance with past practice, if action on the drafts listed in the informal paper for a particular meeting is not completed, the Committee will first

finish action on the remaining drafts in that informal paper before starting action on a new informal paper.

I should like to inform the Committee that at the request of the sponsoring delegations, action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.56, contained in cluster 1, has been postponed to a later stage of the Committee's work.

I now open the floor to delegations that wish to make either a general statement or to introduce new or revised draft resolutions under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons". I remind all delegations once again that the sponsors of draft resolutions and decisions may make general statements at the beginning of the consideration of drafts under a cluster but may not make statements in explanation of their vote before or after action is taken. I also remind delegations once again to deliver statements at a normal speed in order to ensure accurate interpretation.

Mr. Aljowaily (Egypt): Egypt is honoured once again to have presented and introduced two draft resolutions under cluster 1, entitled "Nuclear weapons". The two draft resolutions are A/C.1/69/L.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", and A/C.1/69/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.2/Rev.1 is presented by Egypt on behalf of all the members of the League of Arab States.

The two draft resolutions were introduced by the delegation of Egypt speaking on behalf of the Arab Group at the opening of the thematic cluster discussion on nuclear weapons. I should like at this stage to highlight the following.

First, on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.1, there is a technical update compared to the text adopted by the General Assembly last year. Traditionally, that draft resolution has been adopted without a vote. The current version is a technical update.

On draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.2/Rev.1, the current draft includes language additional to that in the similar resolution adopted last year. In particular, I should like to refer to the new language introduced in the preambular section. One is a reference to the note by the Secretary-General that contained letters received from member States confirming support for declaring the Middle East a region free from weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear, chemical and biological

weapons. That note bears the symbol A/68/781. That is one new addition in the preambular section.

The second addition in the preambular section is taken word by word from the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). There are also new operative paragraphs. I should like to highlight the new operative paragraphs, 2 and 3 in particular, which concern the Middle East only and are taken word by word from paragraph 1 of section IV, entitled “The Middle East, particularly implementation of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East” of the Final Document agreed by consensus at the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

It is the high expectation and sincere hope of all the members of the League of Arab States, on behalf of which Egypt is presenting the draft resolution, that it will continue to receive the largest majority in its favour, as has been traditional with similar resolutions in former years. We consider the voting on this draft resolution to be a litmus test as to how far we are committed to language that has been agreed upon and to the collective commitments of the international community through all the States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It is our high expectation, and I believe that this expectation will be met today.

Mr. Rowland (United Kingdom): I am taking the floor on behalf of the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. As co-conveners, we remain fully committed to the goal of establishing a Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. We also reaffirm our support for the 1995 resolution on the Middle East.

We understand the disappointment expressed by many States in the First Committee that the conference called for in the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) has yet to take place. We continue to support the convening of the conference and stand ready to hold it as soon as States of the region reach consensus on its arrangements with a view to ensuring that the conference is attended by all States of the region as envisaged in the 2010 action plan.

In this regard, we welcome the fact that States of the region have participated in five rounds of informal

consultations since October 2013, convened by the facilitator, Under-Secretary of State Jaakko Laajava, and the co-conveners. We believe that consultations have been constructive and substantive and that agreement on conference arrangements is possible and within reach.

In order to achieve agreement, States of the region must be willing to take the difficult decisions that will allow the convening of an inclusive conference. Such a conference would take us closer to our common and long-held objective of a Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction. We urge all States of the region to continue consultations as proposed by the facilitator with the aim of agreeing arrangements so that a conference can be held in Helsinki soon.

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

Mr. Kos (European Union): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU). The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ukraine and Georgia align themselves with this statement.

With regard to the Middle East in the “nuclear weapons” cluster, we would like to make the following observations. The EU continues to strongly support the outcome of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) on the Middle East and remains fully committed to the establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems in the Middle East. We regret that it has not been possible so far to convene a conference on the establishment of such a zone to be attended by all States of the region.

We continue to fully support the ongoing preparations and commend the co-conveners and particularly the facilitator, Ambassador Laajava of Finland and his team, for their tireless efforts in this regard. We would have preferred to have more emphasis on the encouraging step constituted by the series of informal meetings in Switzerland in our discussions and their outcome. The EU calls on all States of the region urgently and proactively to engage with the facilitator, the co-conveners and one another with the aim of convening the conference as soon as possible on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region.

We call on all States of the region that have not yet done so to accede to the NPT and the Chemical Weapons

Convention and the Biological Weapons Convention; to sign and ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty; and to conclude with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) comprehensive safeguards agreements, additional protocols and, as applicable, revised small quantities protocols.

The EU fully supports the ongoing diplomatic efforts led by the High Representative, together with China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States, to seek a diplomatic solution with Iran to the Iranian nuclear issue. The EU welcomes the joint plan of action between Iran and the EU, the E3/EU+3, and the Framework for Cooperation between Iran and the IAEA, and the fact that Iran continues to implement the measures under the joint plan of action. It is essential and urgent that Iran cooperate fully with the Agency regarding possible military dimensions. The EU underlines that resolving all outstanding issues will be essential to achieving a comprehensive, negotiated long-term settlement, which is the EU's objective. It is vital that Iran engage fully with the IAEA to resolve all outstanding issues in order to build international confidence in the exclusively peaceful nature of the Iranian nuclear programme. The EU is deeply concerned that the Agency is unable to provide credible assurances about the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities in Iran and therefore is not able to conclude that all nuclear material in Iran is in peaceful activities.

Finally, the EU fully supported the adoption of the resolution of the Board of Governors of 9 June 2011, which reported Syria's non-compliance with its safeguards agreement to the Security Council and the General Assembly. The EU deeply regrets that Syria has still to remedy its non-compliance by cooperating as a matter of priority and transparently with the Agency to resolve all the outstanding issues and by signing, bringing into force and implementing in full an Additional Protocol as soon as possible. The European Union once again would like to thank the Director-General for his latest report on the implementation of the NPT safeguards agreement in the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba co-sponsored several of the draft resolutions on which we will take action today under the "nuclear weapons" cluster. The draft resolutions are A/C.1/69/L.44, entitled "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear

disarmament"; draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.16, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons"; draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.27, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons"; draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.18, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger"; draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.10, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas"; and draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.57, entitled "Third Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia, 2015".

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.44, entitled "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament", was presented by the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) as a practical response in order to move forward with the objective of nuclear disarmament. The draft welcomes the commemoration of 26 September as the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons and the activities developed by the international community to promote nuclear disarmament. In draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.44, NAM calls for the urgent commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament for the early conclusion of a comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons to prohibit their possession, development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use and to provide for their destruction. Similarly, the draft recalls its decision to convene, no later than 2018, a United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament. We hope that all member States, in particular those that have expressed their concern over the stagnation of the disarmament machinery and the lack of progress towards nuclear disarmament, will support this draft resolution.

As long as we do not achieve the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, we will need to adopt urgently an international, legally binding instrument through which the nuclear-weapon States can grant universal and unconditional security guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of these weapons. That is why draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.27 is of such importance.

Lastly, we support draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.57 because we feel it important to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world as a concrete step towards the objective of nuclear disarmament. In that respect, we reaffirm our firm

support for the establishment without delay of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and also call for the third international conference on nuclear-weapon-free zones.

The Chair: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote before the voting.

Ms. Rahaminoff-Honig (Israel): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.2/Rev.1, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”, which Israel will vote against, is as close to an absurdity as it comes. We could explain at length why this draft resolution is politically biased and motivated by the design of its authors to deflect attention from the real proliferation threats in all their aspects in the Middle East, which include Iran, Syria, Hizbullah and the Islamic State in Iraq and the Sham, but that would simply be to state the obvious.

Our region has witnessed violations of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) by four regional countries, the use of chemical weapons in a number of instances in recent years, the wholesale proliferation of rockets and missiles including to States and terrorist organizations, the horrendous slaughter of journalists and aid workers, videotaped to ensure terror to the extreme, and the ever-growing proliferation of advanced weapons to terrorist groups in the Middle East. If, after all these phenomena, this body of the United Nations can only produce this draft resolution, it says so much more about the misguided intentions of the sponsors of the draft than it does about Israel. To vote for such a draft resolution is not only to participate in the illusion that Israel is a proliferation risk, but also to perpetuate the illusion that the real threats to the Middle East regional security do not exist.

We could also point out that the draft resolution’s treatment of the whole issue of the Helsinki conference is perplexing, to say the least. While the authors of the draft resolution do not fail to express their regret that the conference was not convened in 2012, they conveniently omit the fact that five rounds of consultations have been convened by Finnish Under-Secretary Laajava in order to promote the consensus that is essential between regional States for such a meeting.

One should not underestimate the importance of these multilateral consultations, as this is the first time in many decades that direct regional discussion has taken place on this complex issue and other matters pertaining to regional security. Israel for its part participated in all five consultation rounds at a senior

and authoritative level and has clearly expressed its willingness to participate in another, sixth round. This process, starting in Glion, saw some measured progress despite substantive conceptual differences. The Group of Arab States decided to seek further instruction before moving on in this process, and the Group’s agreement to participate in a sixth consultation round has been pending now for several months.

Israel finds curious the fact that the authors of the draft resolution prefer to lament the delay of the Helsinki process rather than engage seriously and earnestly in the preparatory work required. One would have to wonder whether the authors of this draft resolution are indeed as committed to this process and conference as they purport to be.

Mr. Ammar (Pakistan): I have requested the floor to explain the position of my delegation before the voting on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/69/L.20, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”.

Last year my delegation opposed the decision to set up a group of governmental experts on a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) on the grounds that such a step would undermine the Conference on Disarmament (CD), as well as the fact that such a group with just a discussion mandate would bring no valuable addition to the Conference on Disarmament’s deliberations on this issue. Our assessment of the proceedings of the group so far justifies our reservations. We therefore see no merit in continuing the work of this group, at great cost to the meagre resources of the United Nations.

The deliberations of the group have demonstrated wide gaps between the positions of the nuclear-weapon States and the non-nuclear-weapon States over vital issues such as fissile material stocks, the definition of fissile material, equitable verification procedures and entry into force. These are fundamental issues that cannot be resolved by a handful of States. Even if they were to resolve these differences, their views will not be binding on the international community.

Another fatal flaw of the group on an FMCT is the absence from its deliberations of two nuclear-weapon States. As a result, this group is stillborn. By contrast, the Conference on Disarmament remains the only appropriate forum for consideration of the fissile material issue. Not only are all the nuclear-weapon States present in the CD, but the mandate of the group

can be and has been the basis of substantive discussions on an FMCT in the CD. The group is therefore a needless diversion and duplication. For these reasons, the Pakistan delegation calls for a vote on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/69/L.20 and will vote against it.

Mr. An Myong Hun (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to present its positions on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.36, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", sponsored by Japan. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea rejects this draft resolution for the following reasons.

First, it contains elements that do not correctly reflect the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula. The draft resolution has expressed concerns over peaceful nuclear activities only against a single country. The draft resolution states that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea cannot have the status of a nuclear-weapon State under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a non-party and not bound by the NPT. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea pulled out of the NPT and manufactured nuclear weapons for the purpose of deterring a United States attack and nuclear threats and defending its sovereignty because the United States designated the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as the target of a pre-emptive nuclear attack.

As long as the United States nuclear threat persists, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will increase and update nuclear weapons as its deterrent. The United States gives the Democratic People's Republic of Korea the grounds and justification for doing that. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not feel any need to be publicly recognized as a nuclear-weapon State. It is enough that it is capable of reliably defending the sovereignty and security of the nation with its own nuclear capabilities. It is unimaginable to expect that my country should return to the NPT as a non-nuclear State. As long as the United States persists in its hostile policy, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will further bolster its nuclear deterrent for self-defence.

The uranium enrichment and light-water reactor construction is in exercise of the deserved sovereign right of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and is intended for peaceful purposes, namely, the generation

of nuclear electric power. Access to nuclear energy is granted to all States. Many countries enjoy the benefit of it. Some of them have developed indigenous nuclear fuel cycles and set up a self-supporting nuclear power industry. Likewise, we consider it a clear provocation to try to reject the exercise of this right.

Secondly, Japan has no qualification to talk about the elimination of nuclear weapons. The three non-nuclear principles of Japan are just a deception. Every year United States nuclear aircraft carriers and submarines freely go in and out of the territorial waters of Japan. Plutonium is piled up in excess and political figures within Japan raise their voices calling for the nuclear weaponization of Japan. The draft resolution introduced by Japan is full of prejudice, distortion and hypocrisy. Therefore my delegation will vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): My delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". The United States believes that again this year this draft resolution fails to meet the fundamental tests of fairness and balance. It confines itself to expressions of concern about the activities of a single country, omitting any reference to serious nuclear-proliferation concerns in the region. The most glaring omission continues to be the lack of any reference to cases of non-compliance with International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards, Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) obligations, and relevant Security Council resolutions in the region.

Notwithstanding our "no" vote, I should like to reiterate the long-standing position of the United States in support of universal adherence to the NPT and to the goal of establishing a Middle East zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. That is an achievable goal provided that peace and security in the region and full compliance by States with their non-proliferation undertakings can be assured.

I should also like to highlight our continued efforts to build the confidence necessary to ensure a successful regional conference to discuss a Middle East zone free of all weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. There has been no shortage of effort to convene the Helsinki conference and reach consensus among the regional States on an agenda and other modalities. The regional States have met five times in the past year with the support of the conveners and the facilitator. Israel has participated constructively

and at senior levels in all five rounds of consultations and has demonstrated its commitment to attending the conference once agreement is reached.

Our commitment to supporting this process remains and will continue so long as the States in the region are willing to address their differences directly and constructively. We hope the regional parties will continue to meet and exhibit the skill and determination needed to produce an agreement soon. I also wish to note that pursuit of resolutions such as this, year after year, do nothing to improve confidence in the region or prospects for reaching agreement on a conference on a zone free of weapons of mass destruction. We find this regrettable and call on the sponsors to take a more constructive approach in United Nations forums such as the First Committee.

I am now delivering an explanation of vote on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.21, entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”. Our view remains that we already have sufficient forums for discussion on taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations as recorded at the 1978 United Nations special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Moreover, as we stated last year, we have concerns over the consistency between this initiative and the NPT and its 2010 action plan adopted by consensus.

The NPT is the cornerstone of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and the basis for our nuclear disarmament efforts. However, the 2010 NPT action plan did not receive a single mention in the final report of the Open-ended working group, and the urgency of negotiating a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) — which is a clear priority for the international community — was diluted. We view this major omission as reflecting a substantial and unwarranted focus on other parallel processes that detract from the consensus-based approach embodied in the 2010 action plan, which provides a realistic, balanced way forward on all three NPT pillars. We remain concerned by processes that focus solely on nuclear disarmament whereas the NPT covers all three pillars in a balanced manner. It is for these reasons that we will vote against this draft resolution.

I should now like to deliver an explanation of vote on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.44, entitled

“Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”. The United States, the United Kingdom and France took part in the 2013 high-level meeting on nuclear disarmament in good faith. Our three countries delivered both national and joint statements. Unfortunately, as was the case last year, this draft resolution again does not reflect views we expressed at that time nor, in our opinion, the views of many other States that participated.

We believe that nuclear proliferation and non-compliance by a few States with their respective obligations constitute the most serious threat to international security and peace, and we therefore regret that the high-level meeting did not deal with both nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in a balanced manner. Success in halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons is among the international conditions that will support step-by-step progress towards the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament.

The only reference to the NPT in the draft resolution is insufficient, incidental and unbalanced. In addition, we remain puzzled at the fact that there is no reference to the 2010 action plan. The NPT is the cornerstone of the non-proliferation regime and the basis for nuclear disarmament efforts. The 2010 NPT action plan provides the best route for making progress on multilateral nuclear disarmament. We are concerned that some States appear to be moving away from the consensus reached in 2010.

Furthermore, the draft resolution calls for negotiation of an instrument that is not mentioned as such in the 2010 action plan. We remain convinced that a practical step-by-step process is the only way to make real progress in our disarmament efforts while upholding global security and stability. There are no shortcuts. There is no other way to achieve a world without nuclear weapons outside of methodological and steady progress. Following this process, we are seeking the early commencement of negotiation of an FMCT and the prompt entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. In the NPT action plan, all NPT States parties concurred that the next priority step towards nuclear disarmament in the multilateral context is an FMCT.

Finally, the next Review Conference of the NPT will take place in 2015. Planning another conference to discuss nuclear disarmament in 2018 is not consistent with the NPT agenda and risks weakening commitment

among States to securing a successful outcome to the Review Conference.

Mr. Luque Márquez (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): Beginning at the sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly, our delegation expressed regret at the fact that, in the versions of the draft resolution contained this year in document A/C.1/69/L.36, entitled “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, the operative paragraph that calls for the commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty omitted any express mention of the Conference on Disarmament as the natural forum for its discussion, which led my delegation to abstain for three years in the voting on the draft text, because we felt that it set aside a primary component of the disarmament machinery as conceived at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

As a result, we welcome the fact that the ongoing appeal of the delegation of Ecuador and other delegations has finally been heard and that an explicit mention of the Conference on Disarmament has been incorporated into operative paragraph 11 of the draft resolution, as a result of which it will be possible for us this year to vote in favour of this draft resolution.

We believe it crucial, however, to point out that my delegation will carefully review the version of the draft resolution that will be submitted next year, because we believe that elements are still lacking in the text that are crucial if we want a resolution that encompasses all elements related to nuclear disarmament and reflects the development of the deliberations of the international community in this area. I refer, among other things, to the necessary references to a legally binding instrument that would contain negative security guarantees for States that do not possess nuclear weapons and a convention that would prohibit the development, possession and use of these weapons.

I must also mention the important observations that, as we know, some countries of that region have made with respect to the current drafting of operative paragraph 17 on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, and that cite necessary references to the decisions taken in this area at the Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) held in 1995 and 2010. My delegation is ready to cooperate with the main sponsor of the draft resolution in order to offer specific proposals that we believe would improve the text in

future and help to ensure that it will continue to be relevant, taking into account the current state and progress of our deliberations on nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Aljowaily (Egypt): I should like to provide the following explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.36, entitled “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”. Egypt fully shares with the delegation of Japan the objective of united action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons, which is the title of the draft resolution. The formulation of the draft resolution, however, falls short of expectations for achieving that objective. Despite this concern, which was present at preceding sessions of the First Committee, we had demonstrated the utmost flexibility in the past with regard to those versions of the draft resolution put forward to those sessions of the First Committee. Allow me to highlight the following points.

First, Egypt is most gravely concerned that the conveners did not hold the conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in 2012, as mandated by the final outcome of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) agreed to by consensus. This severely impacts the value of the review process and the Treaty itself.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.36, while we are appreciative of the preambular paragraph recalling the decisions and the resolution of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Final Documents of the 2000 and 2010 Review Conferences, Egypt is concerned, and has serious reservations, regarding operative paragraph 17 of A/C.1/69/L.36, which relates to the Middle East.

Among many other reservations, we see that the current formulation of operative paragraph 17 regarding the Middle East in draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.36 is incomplete, as it omits any—and I stress any—reference to the 1995 resolution on the Middle East and the 2010 NPT Review Conference final outcome adopted by consensus. These two are the only agreed terms of reference for the conference. Operative paragraph 17 is also selective. It chooses only some elements and discards other most important and relevant ones.

We consulted with the sponsoring delegation many times over a period of almost five months with

every good intention from our side to find a mutually acceptable formulation. However, unfortunately there was not a single positive response to our reservations and serious concerns and not once has the sponsoring delegation shared with us language that could bridge the differences, insisting instead on the current formulation that members see before them, which was shared with us only this month, October 2014.

Secondly, Egypt is strongly supportive of paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.36, presented by Japan, which reaffirms the vital importance of the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and

“calls upon all States not parties to the Treaty to accede as non-nuclear-weapon States to the Treaty promptly and without any conditions and, pending their accession to the Treaty, to adhere to its terms and take practical steps in support of the Treaty”.

Until this objective is achieved, it remains the prerequisite of any other additional and voluntary instruments such as the additional protocol to the agreement between each State and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for the application of safeguards, which was approved by the Board of Governors of the Agency on 15 May 1997.

Thirdly, regarding paragraph 10 of the draft resolution, we had proposed a minor amendment in a constructive effort to develop the paragraph by using agreed language from Action 10 of the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference, which places a rightful special emphasis on those States

“which have not acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and continue to operate unsafeguarded nuclear facilities, to sign and ratify.” (*NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol.I)*, p. 22).

Unfortunately, even this agreed language adopted by consensus in 2010 was once again not accepted nor was any other language proposed in this regard.

In the light of all this, Egypt will abstain in the voting on paragraph 17 regarding the Middle East, given the serious reservations mentioned earlier in my statement.

Mr. An Myong Hun (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft decision A/C.1/69/L.20, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”. My

delegation expresses concern that the draft decision contains provisions that allow pursuing negotiations outside the Conference on Disarmament (CD). The CD is the sole multilateral negotiating forum and the appropriate venue for consideration of disarmament issues. Any attempt to take negotiations away from the CD would undermine the authority and confidence of the CD. If there are dissenting issues, more efforts should be devoted to achieving compromise and possible consensus.

Canada, the sponsor of the draft decision, has a record of behaving irresponsibly, as it alone boycotted my country’s presidency of the CD last year. The major obstacle facing the disarmament negotiations in the CD is the lack of political will by some countries to address all core issues in an equal and balanced manner and not the shortcomings of its structure or working methods. It is for this reason that my delegation will abstain in the voting.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to explain the position of my delegation regarding draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.36, entitled “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”. Achieving the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons as the only absolute guarantee against their use has the highest priority in the Islamic Republic of Iran’s policy in the area of disarmament. Accordingly, we share the main objective of the draft resolution, which calls for the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

We support paragraph 3, which reaffirms the vital importance of the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). However, we cannot accept the assertion that the fulfilment of nuclear disarmament obligations is conditional upon the enhancement of international peace and security, as suggested in the sixth preambular paragraph. Full compliance with legal obligations and nuclear disarmament under any circumstances is essential to achieving the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

The draft extensively addresses certain regional issues related to the East Asia region, but ignores equally addressing the proliferation risk posed by the unsafeguarded nuclear facilities of the Israeli regime, as the only non-party to the NPT in the Middle East region. Furthermore, in paragraph 17 the sponsor of the draft resolution has overlooked the agreed mandate for convening a conference on the establishment of a

Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, as contained in the 2010 NPT Review Conference Final Document. This clearly demonstrates a lack of consistency and integrity on the part of the sponsor in dealing with the agreement of the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

With regard to the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the draft resolution suffers from a significant imbalance because it focuses only on a fissile material cut-off treaty and fails to call for the urgent commencement of negotiations on nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament.

For these reasons my delegation has decided to abstain in the voting on this draft resolution as a whole. We urge the sponsor to observe the principle of consistency, transparency and inclusiveness in drafting and conducting consultations on this resolution next year.

While I have the floor, I should like to explain the position of my delegation regarding draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". As with similar draft resolutions in previous years, we will vote in favour of the draft, which deals with the most important aspect of security in the Middle East, namely, the threat of the nuclear-weapons arsenal of the Israeli regime. The aggressive and expansionist policies of that regime, its large arsenal of nuclear and other sophisticated weapons and its non-adherence to international law, norms and principles, is the only source of threat to peace and security in the Middle East and beyond, and the only obstacle to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in this region.

Indeed, peace and stability cannot be achieved in the Middle East as long as such an irresponsible regime has a massive nuclear arsenal, continues to threaten the region and beyond, is outside treaties banning weapons of mass destruction, in particular the NPT, continues an underground nuclear-weapons programme, and defies repeated calls by the international community to comply with international conduct, norms and principles.

Against this backdrop and in order to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East the international community has no choice but to exert maximum pressure on the Israeli regime to eliminate all its nuclear weapons, to accede to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon party without any further delay or precondition, and place all its nuclear facilities under the

International Atomic Energy Agency comprehensive safeguards.

All of us recall that through the consensually adopted Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference, 189 NPT States parties, including all main supporters of the Israeli regime, unanimously called upon Israel by name to accede to the NPT without any condition and put all its clandestine nuclear activities under international safeguards. It indicates as well that, in the view of the international community, there is no source of insecurity and instability in the Middle East and beyond other than the Israeli regime.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.1 was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsor is named in document A/C.1/69/L.1.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.1 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.1/69/L.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.2/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Egypt, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the League of Arab States, at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsors are named in document A/C.1/69/L.2/Rev.1.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested on the draft resolution as a whole. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.2/Rev.1. I shall put these paragraphs to the vote first, one by

one. We shall first take action on the fifth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, 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, Mexico, 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, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, 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, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Pakistan, Rwanda, South Sudan, Togo

The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 166 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on the sixth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, 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, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, 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, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, 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, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, 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, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Mauritius, Pakistan, Rwanda, South Sudan

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 167 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.2/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, 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, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates,

United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Canada, Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, India, Italy, Lithuania, Monaco, Netherlands, Panama, Poland, Rwanda, South Sudan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.2/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 151 votes to 4, with 20 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.10, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.10 was introduced by the representative of Brazil at the 12th meeting of the Committee, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.10 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.3.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, 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, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, 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, 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, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), South Sudan

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.10 was adopted by 172 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.11, entitled "Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.11 was introduced by the representative of Kazakhstan at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.11 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Lithuania and the Republic of Moldova have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution 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.1/69/L.11 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.12/Rev.1, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.12/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are named in documents A/C.1/69/L.12/Rev.1 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Montenegro has become a co-sponsor.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph, and operative paragraphs 9 and 11. We shall first take action on the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, 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, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

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

The twenty-fourth preambular paragraph was retained by 163 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 9.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, 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, Mexico, 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, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan, United States of America

Abstaining:

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

Operative paragraph 9 was retained by 163 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 11.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, 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, Mexico, 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, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Russian Federation, United States of America

Abstaining:

France, India, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 11 was retained by 163 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.12/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia,

Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, 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, 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, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Bhutan, China, Haiti, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.12/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 166 votes to 7, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.16, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.16 was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft

resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.16 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, the Bahamas and Saint Kitts and Nevis have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania,

San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Belarus, Japan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Serbia, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.16 was adopted by 123 votes to 48, with 7 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.18, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.18 was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.18 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.3.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Belarus, China, Georgia, Japan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Serbia, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.18 was adopted by 118 votes to 48, with 10 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/69/L.20, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/69/L.20 was submitted by the representative of Canada. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/69/L.20.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus,

Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, 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, 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, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, 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, Zimbabwe

Against:

Pakistan

Abstaining:

Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft decision A/C.1/69/L.20 was adopted by 173 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.21, entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.21 was introduced by

the representative of Ireland at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.21 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Paraguay has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Andorra, Belarus, China, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Monaco, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.21 was adopted by 152 votes to 4, with 22 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.22, entitled "Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.22 was introduced by the representative of Switzerland at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.22 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Malta, Paraguay and Peru have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the eighth preambular paragraph. The Committee will first take action on the eighth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, 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 Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Estonia, France, Hungary, India, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The eighth preambular paragraph was retained by 156 votes to 1, with 13 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.22 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic

Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, 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 Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Andorra, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Estonia, Hungary, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Republic of Korea, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.22, as a whole, was adopted by 163 votes to 4, with 10 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.27, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.27 was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.27 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.3.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, 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, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.27 was adopted by 122 votes to none, with 56 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.36, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.36 was introduced by the representative of Japan at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/69/L.36 and A/C.1/69/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Nepal, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Solomon Islands, Guyana, Cambodia, Nauru and Seychelles have become co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 3, 11, 17 and 20 of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.36. I shall put these paragraphs to the vote first. The Committee will first take action on operative paragraph 3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, 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, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar,

Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Mauritania, Oman, Pakistan, Uganda, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 3 was retained by 164 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 11.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, 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, 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, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

China, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel

Operative paragraph 11 was retained by 166 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 17.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia,

Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Bahrain, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Uganda, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 17 was retained by 148 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 20.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, 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, 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, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, 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, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Argentina, Brazil, India, Israel, Pakistan

Operative paragraph 20 was retained by 165 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.36 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia,

Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, 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, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, 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, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

Brazil, China, Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mauritius, Myanmar, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.36, as a whole, was adopted by 163 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.44, 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.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.44 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/69/L.44. In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

In operative paragraphs 5, 9 and 11 of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.44, the General Assembly would recall its decision to convene, no later than 2018, a United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament to review the progress made in this regard; request the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly to make all the necessary arrangements to commemorate and promote the International Day, including by convening an annual meeting of the General Assembly to commemorate the International Day and to provide a platform for the promotion of these activities; and request the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States with regard to achieving the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, in particular on the elements of a comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons, and to submit a report thereon to the General Assembly at its seventieth session, and also to transmit the report to the Conference on Disarmament.

Pursuant to operative paragraph 5, a United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament would be convened no later than 2018. However, all issues related to the conference, including the date, format, organization and scope, are yet to be determined. Accordingly, in the absence of modalities for the conference, it is not possible at the present time to estimate the potential cost implications of the requirements for the meeting and documentation. Upon the decision on the modalities, format and organization of the conference, the Secretary-General would submit the relevant costs of such requirements in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. The dates of the conference will have to be determined in consultation with the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management.

Pursuant to the request contained in operative paragraph 9, it is envisaged that the annual meeting of the General Assembly to commemorate the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons will comprise one meeting with interpretation in all six languages beginning in 2015. This would constitute an addition to the meetings workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management. It would entail additional requirements in the amount of \$11,500 for meeting-servicing effective 2015.

It is anticipated that the request contained in operative paragraph 11 for documentation would constitute an addition to the documentation workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management of one document of 8,500 words to be issued in all six languages. This would entail additional requirements in the amount of \$50,900 for documentation services in 2015.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.44, additional requirements of \$62,400 for 2015 under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management, would arise, which would be met from within the approved resources of the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015. The additional resource requirements related to the annual meeting in the amount of \$23,000 that would arise for the biennium 2016-2017 will be included under section 2 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to resolution 68/307, of 10 September 2014, in which the General Assembly reiterated its invitation to the Secretary-General, the President of the General Assembly and the Chairs of the Main Committees, in consultation with the General Committee and Member States, to enhance the coordination of the scheduling of high-level meetings and high-level thematic debates with a view to optimizing the number, especially during the general debate, and distribution of such events throughout the session; and reaffirmed resolution 57/301, of 13 March 2003, by which the General Assembly, inter alia, decided that the general debate shall be held without interruption, and encourages the scheduling of future high-level meetings during the first half of the year, from within existing resources, taking into account the calendar of conferences and without prejudice to the current practice of convening

one high-level meeting in September at the beginning of each session of the Assembly.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, 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, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, 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, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Japan, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.44 was adopted by 135 votes to 24, with 18 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.57, entitled “Third Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia, 2015”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.57 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/69/L.57. In addition, New Zealand has become a sponsor.

Concerning this draft resolution, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of operative paragraphs 1 and 4 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide to convene the third Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia, as a one-day conference in New York in 2015”; and request the Secretary-General to provide a conference room in the United Nations Headquarters for the one-day conference in 2015, along with the necessary assistance in conference services as may be required for the third Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia.

Pursuant to the request contained in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, it is the understanding of the Secretary-General that conference services to the third Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia would be required for its implementation. Conference services requirements consisting of two meetings with interpretation services and documentation services requirements are estimated at \$42,539. Non-conference-services requirements consisting of information and communications technology services, security services and miscellaneous supplies services are estimated at \$3,500. In addition, the United Nations

would levy a charge to defray the administrative and other support costs incurred, in accordance with established procedures. Such expenses are estimated at \$5,985. Furthermore, in accordance with established policies and procedures in the United Nations, a provision of \$6,906 would be required to cover eventual shortfalls and final expenditures. In summary, the total estimated costs for the convening of this Conference amount to \$58,930.

All costs related to the third Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia shall be met in accordance with the arrangements made by the States parties to the Treaties. In this regard, the request that the Secretary-General provides a conference room, including interpretation services, as may be required for the third Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia would not have financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations.

It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties, under their respective legal instruments, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations. These activities would be undertaken by the Secretariat after sufficient funding is received, in advance, from States parties. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.57 would not give rise to financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, 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, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.57 was adopted by 169 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: I now call on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position after the voting.

Mr. Aljowaily (Egypt): Egypt would like to present the following explanation of vote on draft decision A/C.1/69/L.20, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices". Egypt has always considered a treaty on fissile material to be an important step towards achieving nuclear disarmament. This can be clearly seen in the inclusion of step 3 in the New Agenda Coalition-sponsored language on the 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts towards nuclear disarmament in the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Step 3 called

on the Conference on Disarmament to negotiate a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, "taking into consideration both nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation objectives".

Ms. Vladulescu (Romania), Vice-Chair, took the Chair.

Draft decision A/C.1/69/L.20, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", refers to General Assembly resolution 67/53, of 3 December 2012. Egypt maintains that resolution 67/53 did not adequately meet the basic requisite to clearly include stockpiles from past production of fissile material for military use in any potential treaty. The resolution lacked operative language clearly referring to the potential treaty having to contribute to achieving general and complete nuclear disarmament.

We welcome the creation of the Group of Governmental Experts mandated to

"make recommendations on possible aspects that could contribute to but not negotiate a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices" (*resolution 67/53, para. 3*).

I commend the Chair of the Group, Ambassador Elissa Goldberg, for her transparent and participatory management of the activities of the Group. The expert from Egypt contributed actively and substantively to its deliberations with a view to ensuring that any potential fissile material treaty would take into consideration both nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation objectives. Egypt will also continue to seek the early adoption of a comprehensive and balanced programme of work for the Conference on Disarmament that would deal not only with a fissile material treaty but also with all core issues on the agenda of the Conference. For the aforesaid reasons and in the aforementioned context, Egypt abstained in the voting on the decision.

Mr. Varma (India): I wish to explain India's vote on a couple of draft resolutions in cluster 1. I will start with draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". India abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.2

as a whole and voted against the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs, as we believe that the focus of the draft resolution should be limited to the region that it intends to address.

India's position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is well known. The 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which codified the prevailing customary international law, provides that States are bound by a treaty based on the principle of free consent. The call to those States remaining outside the NPT to accede to it and to accept International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards on all their nuclear activities is at variance with this principle and does not reflect current realities. India is not a party to the NPT and is not bound by its outcome documents. This applies also to certain operational paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.2.

I turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.12, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". India remains committed to the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. We are concerned about the threat posed to humanity by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use or threat of use. India also shares the view that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing. We continue to support a time-bound programme for global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament. We voted against the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/69/L.12, as well as its paragraph 9, since India cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear-weapon State. In urging India to accede to the NPT promptly and without conditions, the draft resolution negates the rules of customary international law, as enshrined in the Vienna Law of Treaties, which provides that a State's acceptance, ratification or accession to a treaty is based on the principle of free consent.

India's position on the NPT is well known. There is no question of India joining the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Nuclear weapons are an integral part of India's national security and will remain so pending global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament. Although India supports the commencement of fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in accordance with CD/1299, and the mandate contained therein, we abstained in the voting on paragraph 11

since it refers to the 2010 NPT action plan. We note that this year the draft resolution makes several references to the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, and urges its consideration in the framework of the NPT, a treaty that focuses exclusively on restraint on the possession of nuclear weapons and is completely silent on restraint on the use of nuclear weapons.

India participated in the Oslo and Nayarit Conferences on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons in the hope that renewed attention to the most serious threat to the survival of humankind posed by the use of nuclear weapons would help generate momentum for increased restraint on the use of such weapons and thus correct any imbalance in the international legal discourse that has focused almost exclusively on restraints on possession. If those discussions are to be meaningful, it is important that they be inclusive, with the participation of all States, including the nuclear Powers. In terms of substance, they should do no harm to the non-proliferation regime or impede genuine progress towards the goal of nuclear disarmament. In terms of process, they should do no harm to the established disarmament machinery.

I now turn to draft decision A/C.1/69/L.20, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices". It has been India's consistent position that without prejudice to the priority we attach to nuclear disarmament, we support the negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament of a non-discriminatory and internationally verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

India submitted its views on an FMCT for the report of the Secretary-General, as called for in resolution 67/53. India is participating in the Group of Governmental Experts on an FMCT, established under resolution 67/53. As we stated at the time of the adoption of that resolution in 2012, the work of the Group amounts to neither prenegotiation nor non-negotiation of an FMCT, which should take place in the CD. We hope that the work of the Group will strengthen international resolve for the early commencement of FMCT negotiations in the CD on the basis of the agreed mandate contained in CD/1299. India supports the CD as the world's single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum and hopes that its member States will redouble efforts to enable the Conference to commence substantive work at an early date.

On draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.21, entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”, India voted in favour. In 2012, we abstained in the voting on the resolution principally due to our concerns on the impact of this body on the established disarmament machinery. India participated in the Open-ended Working Group meetings in 2013 due to the highest priority we attach to nuclear disarmament.

While India decided to vote in favour of this draft resolution, in recognition of the importance of sustaining efforts on multilateral nuclear disarmament, we would like to highlight our continuing concerns on parallel initiatives that could impact on the established disarmament machinery. India views the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum with the mandate, membership, credibility and rules of procedure to discharge that responsibility. Our vote on this draft resolution is without prejudice to our principled position on the role of the CD as the forum for taking nuclear disarmament negotiations.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.22, entitled “Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems”, India has been sponsoring the draft resolution entitled “Reducing nuclear danger”, which has been adopted by the Committee by a large majority for more than a decade now, including today. When draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.22, on decreasing the operational readiness was introduced for the first time in 2007 and again in 2008, 2010 and 2012, India extended support, given the common objectives and congruence in the context of these two drafts resolutions. Unlike some of the sponsors of this draft resolution, India’s approach is to assess texts by an objective standard and on their merits. Despite the negative vote exercised by some of the sponsors of A/C.1/69/L.18, India voted for the draft resolution in document A/C.1/69/L.22 in view of the importance we attach to de-alerting as an important and practical step in the process of reducing nuclear danger.

However, we abstained in the voting on the eighth preambular paragraph. India’s position on the NPT is well known. India is not a party to the Treaty and is not bound by its outcome documents. Further, the issue that this draft resolution seeks to address is not limited to the context of a specific treaty — a point that some of the sponsors have themselves made to us with regard to India’s resolutions. We hope that the sponsors of the

draft resolution will adopt an objective standard for casting similar votes for similar resolutions.

On draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.36, entitled “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, India remains committed to the goal of global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament in a time-bound framework. We have stressed the need for a step-by-step process underwritten by universal commitment and an agreed multilateral framework for achieving global and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament. In substantive terms, the draft resolution falls short of this objective.

India voted against paragraph 3, as we cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear-weapon State. India’s position on the NPT is well known. There is no question of India joining the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Nuclear weapons are an integral part of India’s national security and will remain so pending non-discriminatory and global nuclear disarmament.

India also abstained in the voting on paragraph 20. The concept of a comprehensive safeguards agreement is applicable only to non-nuclear-weapon States party to the NPT. India has concluded an India specific safeguards agreement with the IAEA and has signed and ratified a Protocol additional to that agreement. As India supports the commencement of negotiations on an FMCT in the Conference on Disarmament, the question of a moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons does not arise. We therefore abstained in the voting on paragraph 11.

Mr. Sano (Japan): I should like to explain Japan’s position on draft resolutions A/C.1/69/L.27 and A/C.1.69/L.36.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.27, we voted in favour because it is important to deepen substantive discussions on ways to increase the effectiveness of negative security assurances and to seek a common approach on negative security assurances acceptable by all. However, the draft resolution should not prejudice the discussion in the Conference on Disarmament (CD). We strongly hope that each CD member State will demonstrate its flexibility and that the CD will break its long-standing stalemate and advance its substantive work on the negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty and discussions on other important issues.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.36, paragraph 17 reaffirms the General Assembly's support for the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, and calls for the earliest possible convening of a successful conference in Helsinki.

The Acting Chair: The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran has asked to speak on a point of order. I give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): According to the rules of procedure of the Committee, the sponsor of a draft resolution cannot speak on a draft that has been adopted either before or after the voting. I think that the intervention by the representative of Japan is not consistent with the rules of procedure.

The Acting Chair: I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for drawing the attention of the Committee to that. Rule 128 of the rules of procedure was referred to earlier in this meeting, and States sponsors of draft resolutions and decisions are not permitted to make any statements in explanation of their votes either before or after action is taken. They will, however, be permitted to make general statements at the beginning of consideration of the drafts under a given cluster. I ask the representative of Japan to follow that rule.

Mr. Shen Jian (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to take this opportunity briefly to explain our vote on the relevant draft resolutions and decision.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.44, entitled "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament", China has always stood for and advocated the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and supports the purpose and objectives of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.44, in favour of which it voted.

Meanwhile, China is of the view that the principles of maintaining global strategic balance, stability and undiminished security for all should be enshrined in the cause of nuclear disarmament. All issues related to nuclear weapons, including the use of nuclear weapons, should be addressed in the framework of existing multilateral disarmament mechanisms. All parties should fulfil their obligations under the Treaty on the

Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in a comprehensive and balanced manner.

Countries with the largest nuclear arsenals should continue to take the lead in making drastic and substantive reductions in their nuclear weapons. When conditions are ripe, other nuclear-weapon States should also join the multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. To attain the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament, the international community should develop, at an appropriate time, a viable long-term plan composed of phased actions including the conclusion of a convention on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.12/Rev.1, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", China supports the purpose and objective of the draft resolution, although some of its content exceeds that of the action plan of the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. Therefore China abstained in the voting.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.21, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations", China believes that the international nuclear disarmament process should be promoted in the framework of the existing multilateral disarmament mechanisms. Institutions such as the Conference on Disarmament (CD) and the United Nations Disarmament Commission have provided appropriate venues for addressing nuclear disarmament issues. Establishing new mechanisms to deal with nuclear disarmament will only undermine the authority of existing mechanisms and cannot ensure the major parties' participation. Therefore China abstained in the voting.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.36, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", China does not support paragraph 11 concerning the declaration of moratoriums on the production of fissile material for use in nuclear weapons. Such a moratorium is not clearly defined, cannot be effectively verified and will not help to promote the early start of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) in the CD. Therefore China voted against this paragraph and abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

With regard to draft decision A/C.1/69/L.20, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile

material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”, China supports negotiation of a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally verifiable FMCT as soon as possible in the CD, in accordance with the mandate contained in the Shannon report, so as to contribute to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. China participates in the Group of Governmental Experts on an FMCT and took an active part in the informal discussions on an FMCT that took place in the CD this year. China maintains that the CD is the only appropriate venue for the negotiation of an FMCT. The work of the Group of Governmental Experts on an FMCT established in accordance with resolution 67/53 does not constitute, in any form, negotiation or prenegotiation.

Mr. Wood (United States): I am speaking on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.10, entitled “Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas”. We would like to emphasize the importance we attach to the development, where appropriate, of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones. In this regard, we were very pleased on 6 May to sign the Protocol to the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia (Treaty of Semipalatinsk), thereby providing negative security assurances to the Central Asian nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Such zones can make an important contribution to regional and global security provided they are, first, established as set out in the 1999 United Nations Disarmament Commission guidelines, that is, they are supported by all States of the region concerned, and by nuclear-weapon States; secondly, the subject of appropriate treaties including comprehensive safeguards provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA); and thirdly, satisfactorily concluded in consultation with the nuclear-weapon States.

We still believe it is contradictory to propose simultaneously the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone that would be composed largely of the high seas, yet to say that it would be fully consistent with applicable principles and rules of international law relating to the freedom of the high seas and the right of passage through maritime space, including those of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. We continue to question whether the real goal of the draft resolution is in fact the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone covering the high seas. We

do not believe that this ambiguity has been sufficiently clarified. For these reasons, we voted against the draft resolution.

I should like to deliver an explanation of vote on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.12/Rev.1, entitled “Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments”. This is not a new text, and our reasons for not supporting it previously remain consistent. We agree with many of the elements of the draft resolution, particularly those reflecting language in the action plan in the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We nevertheless voted against it, as many other elements continue to take us further away from our common understanding and to introduce new concepts that were never part of the NPT action plan. We regret that the draft resolution does not reflect an equitable balance among the NPT’s three pillars — disarmament, non-proliferation and peaceful uses — and we are therefore disappointed to see it focusing almost exclusively on the nuclear disarmament agenda.

We would also like to see greater emphasis on the need for all States that possess nuclear weapons, not just NPT nuclear-weapon States, to undertake activities that are consistent with a shared objective of making the world safer and more secure. This in no way confers any particular status on such countries, but rather reflects the fact that a comprehensive and global approach to disarmament and non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy is required.

In reviewing the text, we note with regret that the notion of a step-by-step approach to disarmament has almost disappeared, and we are more than ever concerned by the increased focus on parallel processes. We remain convinced that our focus must be on proven measures that promote rather than detract from security and strategic stability as we continue to build upon the major achievements in disarmament today. We believe that the increased energy around the nuclear disarmament debate would be better employed if channelled towards existing processes, helping to tackle blockages in making progress in the practical step-by-step approach. Finally, we are disappointed that the important work undertaken by Ambassador Laajava in fulfilling his mandate has not been appropriately recognized by the authors of the draft resolution.

I am again speaking on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.22, entitled “Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems”. We continue to disagree with the basic premises of the draft resolution, which suggests that the current level of readiness of nuclear weapons increases the risk of the unintentional or accidental use and that lowered alert levels will automatically and in all cases lead to heightened international security. While alert levels can be and have been lowered in response to an improved international security climate, the relationship between alert levels and security is complex and not reducible to simple formulaic responses. We would like to restate that the operational readiness of our respective nuclear-weapon systems is maintained at a level consonant with our national security requirements and our obligations to our allies within the larger context of the current global strategic situation.

In reflection thereof, we have decreased the operational readiness and alert levels of our respective forces since the early 1990s. Additionally, our respective nuclear weapon-systems are no longer targeted against any State. Collectively, those steps have reduced the value of further dealerting as a priority for nuclear disarmament. We would also like to reiterate that our nuclear-weapons systems are subject to the most rigorous command, control and communication systems to ensure against the possibility of accidental or unintentional use and to guarantee that such weapons could be used only at the sole direction of the proper national command authority and to maximize that authority’s decision time.

Finally, I am speaking on behalf of France, the United States and the United Kingdom with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.57, entitled “Third Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia, 2015”. In the past, the Security Council noted its support for the convening of an earlier conference on this subject in its resolution 1887 (2009). We believe that these meetings have made a useful contribution to the field of nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. At the same time, there are some substantive elements of the draft resolution which give us pause.

The policy of France, the United Kingdom and the United States towards nuclear-weapon-free zones was set out in the explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.10, entitled “Nuclear-weapon-free southern

hemisphere and adjacent areas”, given by our delegation on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

In that context, we would like to make clear that we cannot endorse the language in the third preambular paragraph. We also cannot give an unqualified endorsement to paragraph 172 of the Final Document of the Sixteenth Non-Aligned Movement Summit, held in Tehran in August 2012, nor to the proclamation of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States referred to in the eighth preambular paragraph. We would like to thank the United Nations Secretariat for its oral statement clarifying that the cost related to the third Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia “shall be met in accordance with the arrangements made by the States parties to the Treaties” and “would not have financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations”.

We would also like to thank the sponsors for their additional confirmation that this conference will not represent a new call on United Nations financial resources and will be absorbed by the parties to the nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties, not NPT member States generally. Finally, we thank the authors and sponsor of this draft resolution for their flexibility in making a few changes to meet other concerns expressed by my delegation. Unfortunately, as noted, some of our concerns remained.

Mr. Hajnoczi (Austria): I am taking the floor regarding draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.16, entitled “Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons”. I am honoured to do so also on behalf of Ireland. Austria and Ireland have not supported this draft resolution in the past and maintain this position also regarding this year’s draft.

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.16 does not include any reference to the international nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime and key legal instruments thereof, in particular the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). These instruments have been established with a view to, inter alia, reducing nuclear dangers, advancing nuclear disarmament and preventing nuclear proliferation. While Austria and Ireland are strongly supportive of prohibiting and eliminating nuclear weapons, a draft resolution that has the objective of prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons but does not contain any

references to the international nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime is in our view not sufficient.

Austria and Ireland share a deep concern at the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons and reaffirm the need for all States at all times to comply with applicable international law, including international humanitarian law, as expressed by the 2010 NPT Review Conference. We also want to underline that it is in the interests of the very survival of humanity that nuclear weapons never be used again under any circumstances. The catastrophic effects of a nuclear-weapon detonation, whether by accident, miscalculation or design, cannot be adequately addressed. All efforts must be exerted to eliminate the threat of these weapons of mass destruction.

Preventing the use of nuclear weapons is therefore a key and urgent challenge for the international community. All States possessing nuclear weapons should take urgent and concrete measures to reduce the risk of the use of nuclear weapons. The ultimate guarantee against the use of nuclear weapons, however, can be obtained only by the elimination of these weapons of mass destruction.

Austria and Ireland are pleased that the focus of the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons has gained so much momentum in recent years, and we look forward to broad participation by States, international organizations and civil society at the upcoming Vienna Conference on 8 and 9 December.

Ms. Rahaminoff-Honig (Israel): Israel has joined once again the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.1, entitled “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East”, despite Israel’s remaining substantive reservations regarding the modalities outlined in the draft resolution. This position is taken as an indication of Israel’s continued commitment to a process aimed at the establishment of a more secure, peaceful Middle East free from conflict, war and all weapons of mass destruction. It is also in line with Israel’s participation at a senior and authoritative level in five rounds of consultations under Finnish Under-Secretary Laajava. Israel has also stated its willingness to participate in a sixth consultation round. The Arab response regarding participating in this meeting is unfortunately still pending.

Draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.1 is a consensual text. We would like to remind this body that in the past, in

order to facilitate consensus, the draft resolution was shared by its authors with Israel prior to its submission to the Committee. Israel had hoped that this positive tradition would have been continued. Unfortunately that was not the case.

The text of draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.1 recognizes the importance of a credible — and I emphasize credible — regional security process as an imperative in the attainment of a Middle East free of all weapons of mass destruction and means of delivery. In this, we are in full agreement. A credible regional security process is necessary in order to take into account the security concerns of all regional States and to address them within the context of present regional realities and challenges. It is a sine qua non in the establishment of confidence, mutual understanding and cooperation among regional partners. Seen from a pragmatic and realistic perspective, only once such measures are in place, have taken root and have shown to be durable and conducive can more ambitious undertakings be considered.

A credible process is also closely connected to the widely agreed principle that the establishment of any nuclear-weapon-free zone or weapons-of-mass-destruction-free zone, as in the case of the Middle East, must be based on arrangements freely arrived at. That requires regional States to fully commit themselves to open and direct communication channels to genuine engagement and the acknowledgement of the threats and challenges facing other regional partners. They have to recognize all regional States’ right to exist and the need to build a spirit of conciliation rather than of confrontation. In the final analysis, that is an incremental process where one building block must be placed on top of the other in a stable and sustainable manner.

Unfortunately, the Middle East is sorely lacking in mechanisms that could foster dialogue and enhance greater understandings between regional players. Currently there are no processes in the region that could contribute to the building of confidence, a de-escalation of tensions and conflict resolution as a whole. There is no forum in which direct communications between regional States can address core security issues and encourage the attainment of solutions in a cooperative and forthcoming manner. It is a harsh reality given the instability and turmoil in the region, as well as the tension within and among States. Israel believes that only through direct discussions between regional

partners based on consensus can progress be made and the vision of the Middle East free of war, conflict and all weapons of mass destruction be attained.

On draft resolution A/C.1/69/L.20, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”, the ability of a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) to address the growing proliferation challenges, including non-compliance by States with their international obligations in the nuclear domain, is yet to be

established. This holds especially true for the Middle East, where several States have an exceptionally poor track record of compliance with their nuclear non-proliferation obligations. It has been Israel’s long-standing position that the notion of an FMCT is subsumed in the concept of a Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction, the essential prerequisites for which are far from being fulfilled.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.