



General Assembly

Seventieth session

First Committee

22nd meeting

Monday, 2 November 2015, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Van Oosterom (Netherlands)

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

Agenda items 88 to 105 (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 88 to 105. 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 No. 1/Rev.1 has been circulated in the conference room, and we will first take action on the drafts under each cluster listed therein.

To be very clear, informal paper No. 1/Rev.1, as distributed, contains five fewer draft resolutions under cluster 1 and one fewer draft resolution under cluster 3 compared with the original version circulated last Friday. The deleted drafts are A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1, A/C.1/70/L.25, A/C.1/70/L.28/Rev.1, A/C.1/70/L.41 and A/C.1/70/L.58 under cluster 1 and A/C.1/70/L.48 under cluster 3. The deletions are due either to a request by the sponsor for the postponement of action, or the unavailability at this stage of information on programme budget implications. The Secretariat conveys its regret to the Committee that this information came at the last minute.

Furthermore, I also apologize on behalf of the Secretariat that the physical sets of copies of all draft resolutions were not available early enough. At the moment copies are still being made. Additional sets will be available shortly — a set per one and a half minutes the Secretariat has informed me — at the documentation booth. In the meantime I propose that we proceed with the general guidelines on this action phase and with general statements, and if delegations do not have complete sets in the coming minutes I think that should be okay.

I furthermore 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 following established four-step process of first making general statements under each cluster, secondly, explanations of vote before action, thirdly action on the drafts, and finally explanations of vote after action. Under each cluster listed for any given day the Committee will first hear general statements. I kindly ask delegations to keep these general statements as brief as possible, as delegations will have a final opportunity to introduce draft resolutions and decisions ready for action on that day, or at subsequent meetings.

Next, delegations wishing to explain their positions on any of 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,

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>).

15-34691 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



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 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 meetings begin. All delegations wishing to postpone action on any draft that has been submitted 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.

Mr. Mendiola (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I simply wanted to take the floor to draw attention to the fact that while you, Sir, mentioned draft resolution

A/C.1/70/L.3/Rev.1 as being one of the ones that had been taken out of informal paper No. 1/Rev.1, it should have been A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1.

I should also like to draw attention to the fact that this change at the last minute that has been seen in the order in which the draft resolutions will be taken this afternoon has led to some surprise and consternation among many delegations. My delegation only found out today at midday, for example, that our draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.13 would have programme budget implications, although the Secretariat had told us previously that would not be the case. In the weeks leading up to this meeting, we were told there would be no programme budget implications and then we find out at midday that there are. We are in your hands, Mr. Chair. We hope this will be treated in a transparent way and on an equal footing. I am sure that it will, but my delegation will keep a close eye on the consideration of resolutions in the hope that they will be taken in the order in which they have been presented, as has been the practice of this body in the past.

The Chair: Let me begin by reiterating the apologies I conveyed at the beginning of my statement on behalf of the Secretariat for the fact that the programme budget implications information became available so late. Secondly, when it comes to draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.13, as the representative rightly mentioned, we have taken very good note of the Mexican delegation's wish relating to the order of presentation later this week.

Mr. Wensley (South Africa): I should just like a clarification, Sir. You mentioned draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.3 twice. May I assume that there will be no action on that draft resolution today?

The Chair: Action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.13 has been postponed. Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.3 is on the list and will be treated today.

Mr. Wensley (South Africa): I am looking at informal paper No. 1/Rev.1. I do not see any A/C.1/70/L.13.

The Chair: That is correct, because I said that A/C.1/70/L.13 had been taken out of Friday's copy, so it is correct that you will not see it on today's list because it has been taken out. I explained what had been taken out on Friday to make clear what is in today's list.

Mr. Wensley (South Africa): My apologies, but this seems to be a little chaotic.

The Chair: I apologize as well for the way the last-minute changes of today are reflected in today's proceedings.

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 No. 1/Rev.1, which has been circulated in the conference room. Once we complete action on cluster 1, we will proceed to take action on the draft resolutions 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 the next cluster.

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".

General statements in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions whose action has been postponed should be made when the Committee takes action on those resolutions later this week. 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. Delegations may press the button under their microphones if they desire to speak.

Mr. McConville (Australia): I take the floor to deliver the following statement on behalf of the following 27 countries: Australia, the Netherlands, Canada, Germany, Denmark, Norway, Italy, Spain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Latvia, Iceland, Luxembourg, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Turkey, Slovenia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Albania, the Republic of Korea, Croatia, Georgia, Romania, Estonia and the Czech Republic.

The Committee is about to take action on a group of draft resolutions addressing the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons. We wish to register unequivocally that the grave humanitarian

consequences of a nuclear-weapons detonation are clear and not in dispute. Moreover, we have all engaged actively and constructively on this important humanitarian consequences dialogue over recent years in the firm belief that this agenda should be a force which unites us and reinforces our common and unshakeable commitment to the ultimate elimination of all nuclear weapons. At the same time security and humanitarian principles coexist.

Against this background we would like to register our collective regret that the draft resolutions now before the Committee do not reflect these realities and imperatives. Indeed, they are contributing to increasing international divisions with regard to nuclear disarmament, including by seeking to marginalize and delegitimize certain policy perspectives and positions. All delegations must be able to engage in this important discourse on nuclear disarmament reflecting their distinct national security and other circumstances.

We share the disappointment of other Member States at the lack of progress in disarmament, and do not take it on faith that things will improve without concerted action. We also agree that it requires political will and perhaps new approaches to achieve our disarmament goals. However, we believe that these draft resolutions, both in their content and how they were managed, do not bring us closer to those goals. It is particularly unfortunate that the humanitarian consequences discourse has not been a force for convergence at a time of increased geopolitical tensions and in the wake of the inability of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to achieve consensus on an agreed outcome document.

In our collective view it is now all the more important for the international community to engage in a constructive, open, inclusive and genuine dialogue about nuclear disarmament where all points of view are given due respect and acknowledgement. We all remain firmly committed to engage in such a dialogue and to the goal of achieving a nuclear-free world.

Mr. Nord (Sweden): This year's session of the First Committee has seen the introduction of a number of new draft resolutions, especially in the nuclear-weapons cluster. While that is certainly a welcome development, these new initiatives also reflect worrying developments on the ground. Dissatisfaction is growing with the slow progress of nuclear disarmament. Plans are afoot to modernize nuclear arsenals, and the inertia of the

United Nations disarmament machinery continues. Insecurity is rising, and tensions are increasing between nuclear Powers.

It is against this background that States have provided initiatives and solutions that can increase security and bring us closer to a world free of nuclear weapons. Given the number of initiatives and draft resolutions before us in the First Committee, Sweden would like to provide a brief outline of how we see the way ahead on nuclear disarmament, which also explains our positions on some draft resolutions new and old.

First, human beings should be put at the heart of discussions on international security and disarmament.

Second, nuclear weapons have catastrophic humanitarian consequences and must never be used again under any circumstances. The only way to guarantee this is through their total elimination.

Third, disarmament is not progressing well, and the United Nations disarmament machinery is still. New measures and initiatives are needed to move forward on disarmament. That would also serve to reinforce and revitalize existing structures and forums.

Fourth, new measures should be concrete and aimed at achieving results on the ground, meaning fewer nuclear weapons. It is thus important that possessors of nuclear weapons participate in these efforts, as is their obligation.

Fifth, an open-ended working group on nuclear disarmament would be a suitable, modern, inclusive and democratic forum to discuss new instruments. An open-ended working group should have a strong mandate, building on previous work by open-ended working groups and providing added value compared to existing forums. It should be able to take forward and make a real difference in these matters.

Sixth, an open-ended working group could also elaborate recommendations on issues not dealt with elsewhere, such as risk reduction, a ban on the use of nuclear weapons, or other practical, technical and legal instruments or arrangements.

Seventh, a ban on conventional nuclear weapons is not the only way available to achieve global zero.

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 following countries align themselves with this statement: Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia.

With regard to the Middle East and the nuclear-weapons cluster, I should like to make the following observations. The EU reaffirms its support for the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference and recalls the affirmation of its goals and objectives by the 2000 and 2010 Review Conferences. We consider the 1995 resolution valid until its goals and objectives are achieved.

We deeply regret that the Conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems has not been convened. We maintain the view that dialogue and building confidence among all stakeholders is the only sustainable way to agree arrangements for a meaningful conference to be attended by all States of the Middle East on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at by them as decided by the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We wish to record our appreciation to the facilitator, Ambassador Jaakko Laajava, and his team for their tireless efforts in this regard, including at the five informal meetings in Switzerland.

We call on all States in the region that have not yet done so to accede to the NPT and the Conventions for the prohibition of chemical and biological weapons, 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, modified small quantities protocols.

The EU welcomes the historic agreement of 14 July between the E3+3 and Iran on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), in full conformity with the principle of the NPT. On the basis of Security Council resolution 2231 (2015) and the JCPOA, we fully support the IAEA's long-term mission of verification and monitoring of Iran's nuclear-related commitments for the full duration of these commitments. Its full and sustained implementation, which requires the application and subsequent necessary ratification of the

protocol additional to Iran's safeguards agreement, as foreseen in the agreement, is an essential prerequisite for the IAEA to be able to provide in due course credible assurance about the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities in Iran and provide the international community with the necessary assurances on the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear programme. It will also contribute positively to regional and international peace and security.

In this regard, we welcome the decision taken by Iran on 18 October to provisionally apply the additional protocol. The provisional application and the subsequent ratification by Iran of the additional protocol will demonstrate Iran's commitment to the normalization of the nuclear issue. The EU looks forward to the full and timely implementation of the road map for the clarification of past and present outstanding issues regarding Iran's nuclear programme agreed on 14 July between the IAEA and Iran. It is important that Iran cooperate fully with the Agency regarding possible military dimensions, as agreed in the road map. We underline that resolving all outstanding issues will be essential in the framework of the implementation of the JCPOA and for rebuilding confidence in the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear programme.

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. We deeply regret that Syria has still to remedy its non-compliance by cooperating as a matter of priority and transparently with the Agency to resolve all outstanding issues and by signing, bringing into force and implementing in full an Additional Protocol as soon as possible.

Mrs. Del Sol Dominguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me to make a general statement on this cluster. Cuba has co-sponsored some of the draft resolutions on which we will take action today under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons". I shall refer briefly to some of those draft resolutions.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.15, entitled "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament", presented by States members of the Non-Aligned Movement, promotes specific action to be taken to achieve nuclear disarmament, including the urgent commencement of negotiations aimed at the adoption of a convention banning nuclear

weapons and calling for their destruction. We also very much welcome the designation of 26 September as the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, and reiterate our appeal for convening, at the latest in 2018, of a high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament. We hope that all Member States will support this important draft resolution.

On draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.32, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", we reiterate our demand for the urgent adoption of a legally binding international instrument whereby nuclear-weapon States would provide universal and unconditional security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of such weapons. We believe that this draft resolution is extremely timely.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.44, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", is a document that most fully and comprehensively addresses the issue of nuclear disarmament, which is and must remain our highest disarmament priority. The draft resolution identifies important practical actions aimed at achieving the prohibition and total elimination of nuclear weapons. We welcome the fact that this year the draft resolution has been duly updated and its language strengthened.

Finally, in draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.51, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons", we endorse the important unanimous conclusion reached by the International Court of Justice in 1996 that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects, under strict and effective international control.

Nuclear disarmament cannot continue to be an objective that is endlessly postponed or burdened with conditions. At this session, the Committee can make a difference by taking concrete steps to achieve nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Kmentt (Austria): The debate on nuclear weapons in the First Committee was intense and very interesting. Many different opinions on substance and process were voiced and while the degree of divergence on some issues should be of great concern for all of us, there are key points where the international community is increasingly coming together. Austria was therefore very encouraged to see that the grave concern about the

unacceptable humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons was again highlighted by a great number of member States, as had been the case during the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) earlier this year.

The compelling evidence on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons and the risks associated with these weapons should be at the centre of all deliberations and the implementation of obligations and commitments with regard to nuclear disarmament. Austria therefore hopes that draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.37, entitled “Humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons” that is put to the First Committee for consideration on behalf of more than 100 sponsors, as well as draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.38, entitled “Humanitarian pledge for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons”, submitted by 80 sponsors, will receive the broadest possible support among States Members of the United Nations. I should like to thank all sponsors for the support that they have lent to these draft resolutions.

It is our conviction the humanitarian focus is the best hope to shore up support for the NPT and to create and maintain a strong nuclear-disarmament and non-proliferation regime. It should be seen as a wake-up call and as an issue that unites the international community in urgent and determined action away from reliance on nuclear weapons. We often hear in our discussions the notion that nuclear disarmament must be based on the principle of undiminished and increased security for all. Unfortunately, this point is invoked mostly by States that possess nuclear weapons to argue against or to give conditionality to nuclear disarmament steps that they consider negatively affect their perceived security.

In the light of the evidence available today about the global humanitarian impact and the risks associated with the existence of nuclear weapons, the arguments for the retention of nuclear weapons should be considered as an anachronistic, high-risk and ultimately irresponsible gamble based on an illusion of security and safety. As long as these weapons exist, the security of all humankind is dangerously diminished. The real issue is not the use of nuclear weapons nor who possesses them. There are no right hands for the wrong weapons. We need to get away from the notion of threatening unacceptable global consequences and mass destruction as being a tool for security. This notion, as Pope Francis underscored at the beginning of

this session of the General Assembly is “a contradiction in terms and an affront to the entire edifice of the United Nations” (*A/70/PV.3, p. 5*).

Mr. Kyaw Tin (Myanmar): I have the honour to make the following general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.44, entitled “Nuclear disarmament”. As in previous years, the First Committee is taking action today on this important text, which is sponsored by 52 member States this year. Indeed, nuclear disarmament has always been and will always be at the top of the disarmament agenda for many of us at this Committee.

As we have stated time and time again, we firmly believe that their total elimination is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. For this very reason, Myanmar has the honour of introducing once again to this Committee this important and comprehensive draft resolution, which shares the views and determination of member States to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons.

This draft resolution on nuclear disarmament was first introduced to the Committee in 1995, exactly 20 years ago. Since then, it has enjoyed the strong support of a large majority of member States. The number of sponsors and the countries that have supported this draft resolution has continued to rise each year. My delegation wishes to express its deep appreciation to all those sponsors for their consistent support of this draft resolution. On behalf of the 52 member States that have sponsored this important draft resolution, my delegation wishes to invite all member States to join our efforts to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons by giving their continued support to draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.44.

The Chair: Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions and decisions in cluster 1, we will hear from delegations wishing to explain their position on those drafts. Members should press the button under their microphone if they desire to speak.

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

Mr. Fu Cong (China): I will speak in English in order to save time. First I should like to express our deep condolences to the delegation of the Russian Federation over the tragic loss of life in the crash of the Russian passenger plane. In this hour of immense tragedy

and difficulty, the Chinese people stand shoulder to shoulder with the Russian people.

The Chinese delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.26, entitled “United action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, introduced by Japan. I should like to explain China’s position on the following issues.

First, on the issue of the moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, as referenced in paragraph 15, China has always held that certain moratoriums can be neither clearly defined nor effectively verified and have no practical significance, as it cannot be guaranteed that the fissile material produced will not be used for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

The second issue is the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Needless to say, the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were historic tragedies. We deeply sympathize with the people of the two cities for their sufferings. However, we feel that it is highly inappropriate to highlight those events in isolation. China consistently stands for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and fully understands the concerns of some countries over the humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons, but we do not want to see the issue of humanitarianism taken advantage of by a certain country and used as a tool to obscure and distort history.

This year marks the seventieth anniversary of the victory of the world anti-fascist war and the founding of the United Nations. On this special occasion of historic significance, the international community should be acutely aware that cognition of history is a critical issue that has a direct bearing on whether the outcome of the Second World War will be upheld or whether the international order established thereafter will be maintained. In this regard I should like to emphasize the following points.

First, we must have a correct understanding of the cause and the effect. As history cannot be hypothesized, we will never know whether the tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki could have been avoided. However, everybody knows that this tragedy was a direct result of the aggressive war launched by Japan and the culprits were the Japanese militarists. If we deviate from this

basic understanding, we might be confused about who were the victims and who were the aggressors.

Secondly, historical events must not be interpreted out of context. History should be treated as an indivisible whole. Looking at a specific event in isolation will inevitably distort the whole truth of history. During the war that took place more than 70 years ago, China alone suffered 35 million casualties at the hands of the Japanese aggressors, many of whom were the victims of the Japanese massive use of chemical and biological weapons in violation of international law, including international humanitarian law. Their sufferings were no less than the sufferings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Focusing only on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, while forgetting about the havoc that war wreaked in other countries, is an affront to the memories of the more than 100 million victims of the Second World War, and will also do great damage to the cause of international humanitarianism.

Thirdly, selective amnesia should be avoided. On the one hand, Japan persistently asks the international community to keep in mind the history of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but on the other hand Japan has repeatedly refused to admit its horrendous war crimes, including the Nanjing massacre, in defiance of irrefutable evidence. After the documents related to the Nanjing massacre were included in the UNESCO Memory of the World Register for documentary heritage, Japan not only audaciously accused China of politicizing history but also threatened to stop funding for UNESCO. Japan has gone all out to block efforts to add documents about comfort women to the aforementioned Register. Japan insists that China should not focus on its unfortunate history but wants the whole world to remember Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That is blatant hypocrisy and double standards.

Fourthly, right and wrong must not be confused. Not long ago, the Chinese Government held a solemn gathering in Beijing in commemoration of the seventieth anniversary of the victory of the Chinese people’s war of resistance against Japanese aggression and the world anti-fascist war. As a victim of Japanese aggression, it is only normal and righteous for China to hold such an event. However, to our great surprise the Japanese Government went so far as to publicly criticize Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon for attending this event. If Japan thinks that it is not correct for the victim to commemorate, what right does Japan as the aggressor have to insist on writing into United Nations

resolutions and documents invitations to the leaders and youth of all countries to visit Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Fifthly, correct criteria should be established. The leaders of Germany knelt down more than once in front of the holocaust memorials, winning Germany the respect of people throughout the world. In contrast the Japanese leaders keep paying homage to Japan's convicted class A Second World War criminals at the Yasukuni Shrine. The Japanese Prime Minister even said:

"In Japan, the post-war generations now exceed 80 per cent of its population. We must not let ... further generations to come, who had nothing to do with that war, be predestined to apologize."

What is the logic behind such a statement?

Sixthly, tragic history must not be repeated. While the whole world is reflecting on the history of the Second World War, what is Japan doing? In his speeches, the Japanese leader has spoken voluminously about why Japan went to war, but shows little sign of repentance. At the same time, in contravention of his peace Constitution and in defiance of both domestic and international opposition, the Japanese Government forced through the Parliament new security bills that may pave the way for Japan to use force overseas. While talking about the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons, Japan is still enjoying the benefit of the nuclear umbrella and accumulating a huge amount of weapons-grade fissile material, which far exceeds its legitimate needs. Is that positive pacifism or resuscitated militarism?

China always underlines that we should draw lessons from history and look forward into the future. The purpose of remembering history is not to perpetuate hatred but to prevent a repeat of historical tragedies. We fully understand the Japanese people's wish to be forgiven by the people of neighbouring countries, but that depends on Japan's attitude towards history rather than how fast the international community forgets about history. Forgiveness can be based only on correct recognition of history. To conceal and distort history, or even play victim, is definitely not the way out. A nation that does not have the courage to face up to its own history is in no position to take on greater international responsibilities.

The Chair: Let me, on behalf of the whole Committee, express condolences to the Russian

Federation on the tragic loss of life as a result of the air crash yesterday.

Ms. Rahaminoff-Honig (Israel): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", which Israel will vote against, has been submitted once again by the Group of Arab States. This is a futile attempt to transport this body from the harsh and distressing everyday realities of the Middle East to an alternate universe where facts do not matter and narrow-sighted, short-term, political considerations prevail.

Let us delve for a moment into the imaginary reality created by this draft resolution. By neglecting to address Syria as a continual proliferation threat in the region, the authors of this text would have us believe that Syria joined the Chemical Weapons Convention of its own volition with the full intention of complying with its legal obligations. That is a proposition hard to credit in light of the Syrian regime's systematic use of chemical weapons against its own population, its retention of residual chemical-weapons capability, including research and development, and the gaps and inconsistencies in the Syrian regime's multiple versions regarding the extent of its chemical weapons programme. Are the authors of this draft resolution not disturbed by the attempts of terror organizations to emulate Syria's tactical use of chemicals as a means of warfare? If they are disturbed, they certainly give no such indication in the text.

The draft "risk" resolution similarly chooses to disregard Iran, which continues to be the biggest menace to peace and security in the Middle East and beyond. Are the authors of this draft resolution of the opinion that all of Iran's nefarious activities in the nuclear domain, as well as in the aspects of finance, training and support of terror organizations, are a thing of the past? Do they believe that those Middle Eastern countries that are worried over Iran's subversive activities and hegemonic tendencies will now be able to rest assured that these Iranian plans have been laid to rest? We sincerely doubt that these Middle Eastern countries will sleep more soundly now, even after the signing of the agreement with the five permanent members of the Security Council plus one.

While the authors of the draft "risk" resolution may not accord importance to the fact that four regional countries — Iran, Iraq, Syria and Libya — violated their obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation

of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and promoted clandestine military nuclear programmes, we certainly believe that any draft resolution attempting to outline the real proliferation threats in the Middle East should be concerned by the fact that to some Middle Eastern countries compliance with international obligations is no more than a recommendation.

It is also unfortunate that the draft resolution's treatment of the Helsinki Conference is far removed from the efforts that have taken place in this regard. A genuine and fair attempt to portray the events that took place would not have neglected to refer to the five rounds of direct regional consultations that were conducted between 2013 and 2014 between Israel and its neighbours on the necessary elements to convene a conference on regional security and a Middle East free from wars, hostilities and weapons of mass destruction, including delivery means. While these rounds of consultations, facilitated by Finnish Under-Secretary of State Laajaava, indicated that a conceptual gap remains between the regional parties, they were nevertheless an important start to a necessary dialogue. Israel for its part clearly indicated its willingness to proceed with these endeavours. It was unfortunate that the Arab Group preferred to express regret over the non-convening of the Helsinki Conference rather than invest the hard work and sustained efforts required to achieve consensus in these consultations and bring them to fruition.

Unfortunately, the draft "risk" resolution is detached from reality and from what the peoples of the Middle East have been experiencing: unrest and growing instability, unrelenting violence, large-scale displacement of populations, territories ceded or abandoned to terrorists and a growing threat of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Roaming in the fantastic world created by the draft "risk" resolution will not bring us any closer to achieving a Middle East free from wars, hostilities and weapons of mass destruction, including delivery means. Our feet must be firmly planted on the ground and rooted in realism in order to address the region's challenges in earnest.

Israel has always maintained a policy of responsibility and restraint in the nuclear domain, and that of support of the goals of nuclear non-proliferation. We will continue to do so. We reject this draft resolution in full and call upon members of this body to vote against it. Such a vote will send the required message to the

Arab Group that direct regional engagement, as well as forthcoming attempts to build consensus on the broad range of security issues affecting the Middle East, is the only way to advance this important issue. Attempts to side-track, detour, or shortcut by submitting one-sided and biased resolutions in the multilateral sphere will not succeed, quite the contrary.

Mr. Duarte (Brazil): I am speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/70/L.20, A/C.1/70/L.21 and A/C.1/70/L.38.

Brazil will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.20, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger", because we agree that the risks of unintentional and accidental use of nuclear weapons must be reduced. However, measures such as reviewing nuclear doctrines, de-alerting and de-targeting nuclear weapons, while relevant, cannot be a substitute for multilateral agreements conducive to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. It is our view that the most serious threat to humankind and to the survival of civilization derives not only from the use of nuclear weapons, be it intentional or accidental, but also from the very existence of such weapons. In this context, we once again stress the need to launch negotiations on a complete, comprehensive, and legally binding instrument to completely ban and eliminate nuclear weapons.

Brazil will also vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.21, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", because we share the understanding that nuclear weapons constitute a threat to the survival of mankind and therefore should never again be used. However, Brazil stresses the need to go beyond the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and completely eliminate them, as in our view their very existence constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

Complete, verifiable and irreversible nuclear disarmament must remain a global priority. Towards that end there is an urgent need to launch negotiations on a comprehensive, legally binding instrument banning the development, production, acquisition, possession, stockpiling, retention, testing, use and transfer of such weapons and providing for their complete elimination. We recall the unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish nuclear disarmament in accordance with commitments made under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear

Weapons (NPT). In this context, we also draw attention to paragraphs 81 and 82 of the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

Brazil will also vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.38, entitled “Humanitarian pledge for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons”, because we support its scope, specific provisions and ultimate objectives. Brazil was, alongside our sister nations of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, one of the first countries to endorse the Humanitarian Pledge, issued by Austria at the third conference on the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons, and upon which the present draft resolution is based, and has been a strong advocate of its merits.

Unfortunately, we are not in a position to co-sponsor this draft due to our concern over the term “human security” used in paragraph 2. As Brazil and other countries have stated in other forums, the concept of human security is not sufficiently developed as yet, lacking the precision needed to underpin an official international document. In our view, the draft resolution would gain in clarity by dispensing with it. This specific observation, however, does not interfere with our full commitment to the rationale and goals of this draft resolution, which in our view is an important contribution to achieving nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Luque Márquez (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): Since the sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly, my delegation has abstained in the voting on the draft resolution that this year has been issued as A/C.1/70/L.26 and is entitled “United action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”.

Last year at the sixty-ninth session, as a result of an amendment introduced by the principal sponsor of the draft resolution, we were able to vote in favour of the draft resolution, although we believe that there were still gaps in the text. For this reason, in the explanation of the vote that we provided a year ago, my delegation said:

“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.” (A/C.1/69/PV.20, p. 8)

We had hoped to see a draft resolution that would be truly relevant to what is taking place in the discussions about nuclear disarmament. Regrettably, we are forced to note that the points we raised in our explanation of vote last year on this very same draft resolution have not been taken into account by the principal sponsor. Not only were the suggestions made by my delegation about the need to include a reference to a legally binding universal instrument on negative security assurances not taken into account; the few references to such guarantees that were included in the text adopted last year have been eliminated in the current draft resolution. My delegation will therefore abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.26.

Mr. Rowland (United Kingdom): I am speaking on behalf of France, the United States and my own country, the United Kingdom. I should like to explain our forthcoming votes against draft resolutions A/C.1/70/L.37, entitled “Humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons”; A/C.1/70/L.38, entitled “Humanitarian pledge for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons”; and A/C.1/70/L.40, entitled “Ethical imperatives for a nuclear-weapon-free world”.

Many have argued that devastating humanitarian consequences could result from the use of nuclear weapons. We agree, but neither the consequences nor the concerns are new. They were written into the preamble to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 1968 and captured in the outcome document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in 1978.

The question is what conclusions we draw. Some of those promoting the humanitarian consequences initiative contend that the route to the goal of nuclear disarmament is to prohibit the possession and use of nuclear weapons now, even if those States in possession of the weapons do not sign up to the prohibition. We feel that is the intent behind these three draft resolutions.

We believe a ban on nuclear-weapons risks undermining the NPT, creating a far less certain world of the sort we inhabited before the NPT’s entry into

force and near universality when many regions were faced with the prospect of nuclear proliferation and uncertainty and mistrust impeded access to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We are committed to pursuing the goal of a world without nuclear weapons and we are active here as set out in our respective national statements earlier in this session.

To create a world without nuclear weapons that remains free of nuclear weapons, however, disarmament cannot take place in isolation of the very real international security concerns that we face. We believe that the step-by-step approach is the only way to combine the imperatives of disarmament and of maintaining global stability. Working together we can create the conditions in which nuclear weapons are no longer needed.

Mr. Robatjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to explain the position of my delegation before the voting regarding draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”.

This draft resolution underlines the serious threat posed by the nuclear-weapons programme of the Israeli regime to the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in the Middle East. The aggressive and expansionist policies of Israel, its massive arsenal of nuclear and other sophisticated offensive weapons, as well as its non-adherence to international law, norms and principles, is the most serious source of threat to peace and security in the Middle East, 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 continues its unlawful nuclear-weapons programme and defies the repeated calls by the international community to comply with international norms and principles.

We recall that through the consensually adopted Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference, 189 NPT States parties, including all main allies of the Israeli regime, unanimously called upon Israel by name to accede to the NPT without any conditions and put all its clandestine nuclear activities under international safeguards. We hope that all NPT States parties remember those words and their commitments when they vote on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.2. Iran will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Mahmoud (Egypt): I should like to make a statement in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.26.

Egypt fully shares the objective of general and complete disarmament aimed at the total elimination of nuclear weapons from the entire world. However, the formulation of the draft resolution falls short of our aspirations to achieve that common objective. Therefore Egypt will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole. Accordingly, we would like to highlight the following points in this regard.

First, Egypt reaffirms the fact that nuclear-weapon States have exclusive commitments and obligations to achieve general and complete nuclear disarmament in accordance with article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Nevertheless, several operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, including 2, 4 and 6, equally demand that all States parties to the NPT take effective measures for nuclear disarmament, which is unfair and legally unfounded. Also, nuclear disarmament should not be associated with any other security concerns as reflected in the seventh preambular paragraph.

Secondly, within the framework of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), Egypt firmly believes that there is priority for the remaining nuclear-weapon States to accede to the Treaty before urging the other States listed in annex 2 to join the CTBT. Unfortunately, paragraph 14 does not observe this wide-reaching belief.

Thirdly, while we are satisfied with the preambular paragraph stressing the importance of the decisions and resolutions of the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, since 2013 Egypt has been concerned and has had serious reservations regarding the lack of a direct nexus and clear linkage between the aforementioned terms of reference and the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. We believe that relocating the Middle East paragraph from the operative to the preambular part can send the wrong signal about its importance.

Fourthly, Egypt is strongly supportive of accomplishing the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. That is a solid belief that is all about seeking global nuclear disarmament in all regions of the world without geographic limitations. We therefore reiterate this position as long as it is claimed that this draft resolution addresses the total elimination of nuclear weapons in

the world as a whole according to its title and objective, and not in a specific region relevant exclusively to the sponsoring State as reflected in the current text.

Fifthly, in the future we genuinely hope that this draft resolution will take into consideration our legitimate concerns and reasonable reservations and aspirations in future General Assembly sessions.

Mr. Kang Myong Chol (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation rejects draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.26, sponsored by Japan.

First, it contains assertions that do not correctly reflect the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula. The nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula is the product of the United States' nuclear threats and hostile policy towards the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. If the United States had not threatened the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with its nuclear weapons, the nuclear issue would not have been created on the Korean peninsula.

The nuclear deterrent possessed by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a reliable guarantee for defending the supreme interests and security of the nation and safeguarding regional peace and security in the face of aggressive attempts by outside forces. Whether or not the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is recognized as a nuclear-weapon State under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is not important. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is satisfied that it is safeguarding the sovereignty and security of the nation with its nuclear deterrent.

Secondly, it is unbelievable that Japan has the impudence to talk of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. That Japan sponsored this draft resolution is in itself the height of hypocrisy and deceit. Whenever an opportunity presents itself, Japan has played the role of pathetic victim of nuclear devastation and keeps calling for the abolition of nuclear weapons, but it is no more than a paradox. Japan is under the nuclear umbrella of the United States. Three non-nuclear principles embraced by Japan are full of deception. Plutonium is piled up in excess and Japan is clandestinely pursuing militarism and nuclear-weaponization.

Japan should look back and seriously consider why nuclear weapons were dropped on no other country but Japan. After all, its wild militarist ambition brought it all on itself. Japan should adopt a proper attitude and stance on history, fulfil its moral responsibilities

with regard to the redemption of its shameful past, and promote sincere reconciliation and harmony with neighbouring countries.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea intends to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.26 this year again, as it did last year.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): My delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". As we have reported to this Committee many times before, our vote is based on the fact that such unbalanced resolutions will not advance a Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems.

Progress towards a regional zone agreement will require the engagement and constructive participation of all concerned States. To single out one State for criticism while ignoring the substantial security concerns and compliance challenges that remain in the region will simply not advance this goal. Committee members may rest assured that the United States continues strongly to support universal adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the goal of a Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems. We have been clear that this worthy goal is enormously complex and achievable once essential conditions are in place.

Notwithstanding these challenges, we remain committed to supporting efforts to convene a conference on the establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. Getting there requires that the regional States agree on acceptable arrangements. Politically motivated resolutions will only move the regional States further apart and undermine the trust and confidence necessary for resuming dialogue. We continue to believe that the only way to make meaningful progress is through face-to-face dialogue between the regional parties.

The United States stands ready actively to support such discussions, but the impetus must come from the region itself. We encourage all the regional States, including the sponsors of this draft resolution, to call for renewed regional dialogue so that real progress can be made towards a Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/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.1/70/L.1 was introduced by the representative of Egypt. The sponsor is named in document A/C.1/70/L.1.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/70/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.1/70/L.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.2, 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.1/70/L.2 was introduced by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Group of Arab States. The sponsors are named in document A/C.1/70/L.2.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs. 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, 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, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary,

Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, Palau

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Malawi, Pakistan, Panama

The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 164 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech

Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, 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, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, Palau

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Pakistan, Panama

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 165 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.2, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, 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, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.2, as a whole, was adopted by 151 votes to 5, with 19 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.15, 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.1/70/L.15 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/70/L.15. In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

In paragraphs 5, 6, 10, 12 and 14 of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.15, 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; stress the need to establish a preparatory committee for the United Nations high-level international conference in New York; request the President of the General Assembly to organize on 26 September every year a one-day high-level plenary meeting of the General Assembly to commemorate and promote the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons; request the Secretary-General to undertake all arrangements necessary to commemorate and promote the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, including through the United Nations offices at Geneva and Vienna, as well as the United Nations Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament; 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 seventy-first session, and also to transmit the report to the Conference on Disarmament.

Pursuant to paragraph 5, a United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament would be convened no later than 2018. All issues related to the conference, including the date, format, organization and scope, are yet to be determined. 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 meetings 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.

Pursuant to paragraph 6, the need for a preparatory committee for the United Nations high-level international conference in New York has been stressed. However, in the absence of modalities for such a preparatory committee, it is not possible at the present time to estimate the potential cost implications of the requirements for meetings and documentation. Upon the decision on the modalities, format and organization of the preparatory committee, 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.

Pursuant to the request contained in paragraphs 10 and 12, it is envisaged that the annual meeting of the General Assembly to commemorate and promote the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons will comprise one day of meetings with interpretation in all six official languages. Provisions to meet the associated meeting service requirements of the annual meeting as well as the document referred to in operative paragraph 14 have been included under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.15, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017 at this time.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, 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, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea,

Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Japan, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.15 was adopted by 133 votes to 26, with 17 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.20, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.20 was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 10th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.20

and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Jamaica and Swaziland 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, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, 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 Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, 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, the former Yugoslav Republic of

Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.20 was adopted by 119 votes to 48, with 11 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.21, 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.1/70/L.21 was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee’s 10th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors are listed in A/C.1/70/L.21 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Swaziland has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, 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 Vincent and the

Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, 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, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.21 was adopted by 121 votes to 49, with 8 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.23, entitled “Follow-up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed to at the 1995, 2000 and 2010 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.23 was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the Committee’s 12th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/70/L.23. In addition, Swaziland has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph. I shall put the paragraph to the vote first.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 115 votes to 5, with 49 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.23, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of

Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Georgia, India, Italy, Japan, Monaco, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Samoa, Switzerland, Togo, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.23, as a whole, was adopted by 113 votes to 46, with 15 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.26, entitled "United action with renewed determination 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.1/70/L.26 was introduced by the representative of Japan. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.26 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, the Bahamas, Chad and Mozambique have become sponsors.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 5, 15 and 19 of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.26. We shall take action on these paragraphs one by one. We shall first take action on operative paragraph 5.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, 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, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Pakistan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 5 was retained by 164 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 15.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic,

Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

China, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Israel, Uganda, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 15 was retained by 165 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 19.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

Argentina, Brazil, Egypt, India, Israel, Pakistan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 19 was retained by 162 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.26, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mauritius, Myanmar, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.26, as a whole, was adopted by 156 votes to 3, with 17 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.32, 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.1/70/L.32 was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 10th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.32 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Eritrea and Kazakhstan 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, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, 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 Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay,

Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, 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, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.32 was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 56 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.37, entitled “Humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.37 was introduced by the representative of Austria at the Committee’s 9th meeting, on 19 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.37 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Andorra, the Bahamas and Zimbabwe have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire,

Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Monaco, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.37 was adopted by 136 votes to 18, with 21 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.38, entitled “Humanitarian pledge for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.38 was introduced by the representative of Austria at the Committee's 9th meeting, on 19 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.38 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Andorra and the Bahamas have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian

Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Finland, Georgia, Greece, India, Japan, Montenegro, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uganda

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.38 was adopted by 128 votes to 29, with 18 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.40, entitled "Ethical imperatives for a nuclear-weapon-free world".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.40 was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the Committee's 10th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.40 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Botswana, Malta, Swaziland and Zimbabwe have become sponsors.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, 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, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Palau,

Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Japan, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Pakistan, Republic of Moldova, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.40 was adopted by 124 votes to 35, with 15 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.44, entitled "Nuclear disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.44 was introduced by the representative of Myanmar at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.44 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.3.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 16. I shall therefore put this paragraph to the vote first.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, 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, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, 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 Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Pakistan, Ukraine, United States of America

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, Israel, Palau, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 16 was retained by 163 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.44, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland,

the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Austria, Belarus, Cyprus, India, Ireland, Japan, Malta, Mauritius, Montenegro, New Zealand, Pakistan, Palau, Republic of Korea, Serbia, Sweden, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.44, as a whole, was adopted by 119 votes to 42, with 16 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.46, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.46 was introduced by the representative of Australia on behalf of Mexico and New Zealand at the Committee's 10th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.46 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Belize, Cambodia, Guyana, Papua New Guinea, Somalia and Swaziland have become sponsors.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph. I shall therefore put this paragraph to the vote first.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait,

Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

India, Israel, Pakistan

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 168 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.46, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo,

Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

India, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.46, as a whole, was adopted by 174 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.51, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.51 was introduced by the

representative of Malaysia. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.51 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.3.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Canada, Croatia, Finland, Georgia, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Palau, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.51 was adopted by 129 votes to 24, with 24 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.55, entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.55 was introduced by the representative of Nigeria, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.55 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Chad, Portugal and Swaziland have become sponsors.

The Chair: I call on the representative of Switzerland on a point of order.

Mr. Schmid (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I apologize for taking the floor and beg the Committee's indulgence. I note that Switzerland is not a sponsor of the draft resolution. The fact that our name appears among the list of sponsors is probably an administrative mistake and we ask that it be corrected.

The Chair: That has been duly noted and will be corrected.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.55 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.55 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.56, entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.56 was introduced by

the representative of Nigeria, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.56 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.3. In addition, Swaziland has become a sponsor.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.56 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.56 was adopted.

The Chair: That brings us to the end of voting on draft resolutions under cluster 1.

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

Mr. Van der Kwast (Netherlands): I speak on behalf of the following countries: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland and Slovakia.

We wish to explain our vote against draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.15, entitled “Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”.

Our delegations fully share the long-term goal of the draft resolution, namely, a world free of nuclear weapons. Each of our countries supported the holding of and participated in the high-level meeting on nuclear disarmament on 26 September 2013. During the meeting, we discussed various perspectives on how best to achieve our shared goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world. We regret that the various proposals made during the 26 September meeting were not captured in the resolutions of past years and that only one particular viewpoint appears to have been brought forward. In the draft that was submitted this year, again there is no clear reference to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

We approached the main sponsors with our concerns regarding draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.15. Unfortunately, they were unable to address these concerns. We regret this, and it is for that reason that our delegations again highlight our continuing concerns with A/C.1/70/L.15. The draft resolution includes only limited references to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which we regard as the

central instrument for the achievement of a nuclear-weapon-free world. We welcome the inclusion by the drafters of a reference to article VI of the NPT, but we would have preferred to see a broader reference to the Treaty as a whole.

As laid down in the 2010 NPT Final Document, the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons is indeed the best guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We are concerned that the main aim of the proposed 2018 meeting is unclear. It can be interpreted as either simply another high-level meeting on disarmament to ensure a continued profile for the issue, but also as a potential vehicle to negotiate a nuclear-weapons convention. This, in our view, is regrettable, as we should focus instead on finding and discussing steps towards a nuclear-weapon-free world that unite and not divide us.

That is all the more important after the inability of the 2015 NPT Review Conference to adopt a consensus final document. For this reason, we do not see the need for establishing a preparatory committee to prepare for the 2018 meeting. While the draft resolution rightfully calls for the urgent commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament (CD), it points to only one core issue. We share the frustration expressed in this draft resolution that the CD for more than 16 years has not been able to adopt or implement a programme of work. We continue to call for the adoption of a comprehensive and balanced programme of work within the CD that would allow us to advance the four core issues. We are also firmly convinced that starting negotiations on a nuclear-weapons convention without the participation of the nuclear-weapon States will not advance our shared goal of disarmament.

Finally, as we have already stated, it is our firm belief that neither the United Nations nor the cause of nuclear disarmament will be helped by yet another International Day, and we regret that this year's draft resolution adds further elements to that Day.

Mr. Ammar (Pakistan): Before I start explaining my delegation's position on different draft resolutions I request your indulgence, Mr. Chair, and that of the Committee, because I have 10 draft resolutions on which I will be making an explanation of vote, including A/C.1/70/L.2, A/C.1/70/L.21, A/C.1/70/L.23, A/C.1/70/L.26, A/C.1/70/L.37, A/C.1/70/L.38, A/C.1/70/L.40, A/C.1/70/L.44, A/C.1/70/L.46 and A/C.1/70/L.51.

I shall refer to them one by one starting with A/C.1/70/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”. Pakistan continues to support the primary purpose and focus of this draft resolution. However, we believe that references to the recommendation and conclusions emanating from various Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) need to be qualified. In this context, we are disappointed by the continued but unrealistic call on Pakistan to join the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Pakistan is a nuclear-weapon State, and there is no question of us joining the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State. In view of these considerations, we voted in favour of the draft text as a whole while abstaining on the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs.

On draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.21, entitled “Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons”, Pakistan has consistently voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in this document. However, we wish to note that some of the provisions of the draft resolution are either out of sync with contemporary realities or have been overtaken by other events. We hope the sponsors will take these developments into account.

The subject of nuclear weapons, while relevant and important, needs to be tackled through a comprehensive approach, that is, through 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.

It is also important to recognize the context and motivation of each State possessing such weapons. In the case of Pakistan, in the face of the existential threat to our security, we had no choice but to exercise our legitimate right to defend ourselves through a credible nuclear deterrent capability. The right to self-defence is fully consistent with the spirit, principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and international law. Pakistan firmly believes in the right of every State to equal security. The principle was adopted universally by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD-I) in both the non-conventional and conventional fields and at the regional and international levels. We consider this principle to be an essential prerequisite for the

consideration of a comprehensive approach towards nuclear disarmament.

On draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.23, entitled “Follow-up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed to at the 1995, 2000 and 2010 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons”, my delegation abstained on the draft resolution. Pakistan is supportive of nuclear disarmament. However, as a non-party to the NPT, we neither subscribe to nor are bound by the conclusions and decisions of this Treaty, including those relating to its universality.

In explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.26, entitled “United action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, my delegation continues to disagree with several provisions in this draft resolution. We are disappointed by the lack of engagement and consultation in the review of this draft text. In accordance with our clear and consistent position, we reject the unrealistic call for accession to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State without conditions. We also do not consider ourselves bound by any of the provisions, including those which are adopted by the NPT Review Conferences or other forums in which Pakistan is not represented. Pakistan supports the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, a key goal of this draft resolution.

There are some elements in the draft text that my delegation agrees with. But, having said that, we cannot agree with the proposal for the immediate commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty for reasons we have explained in detail, including in this Committee. It is ironic that a draft resolution seeking united action towards the elimination of nuclear weapons calls only to address the non-proliferation aspect of fissile materials.

As for the universalization of comprehensive safeguards mentioned in paragraph 19, we note with appreciation the reference to the importance of the sovereign decision of any State in this regard. That is an improvement vis-à-vis the previous version. However, we wish to reiterate that the call for the conclusion of comprehensive safeguards agreements applies only to the States which have, out of their free consent, assumed such legal obligations under the NPT. In view of the aforementioned reservations, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole as well as on paragraphs 5 and 19, and voted against paragraph 15.

In explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/70/L.37, entitled “Humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons”; A/C.1/70/L.38, entitled “Humanitarian pledge for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons”; and A/C.1/70/L.40, entitled “Ethical imperatives for a nuclear-weapon-free world”, Pakistan supports nuclear disarmament objectives and the goal of a world without nuclear weapons. We understand the sense of frustration among non-nuclear-weapon States over the slow pace of nuclear disarmament obligations by nuclear-weapon States. Pakistan also shares the concerns and anxieties associated with the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons. We have therefore participated and contributed to this discourse during all three conferences on the subject. At the same time, Pakistan believes that the subject of nuclear weapons, while relevant and important, cannot exclusively be reduced to the paradigm of the humanitarian dimension.

It is important to recognize the context and motivation of each State for possessing such weapons. In the case of Pakistan, in the face of an existential threat to our security we have no choice but to exercise our legitimate right to defend ourselves through our credible nuclear deterrent capability. The right of self-defence is fully consistent with the spirit, principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. Pakistan firmly believes in the right of every State to equal security. That principle was adopted universally by SSOD-I both in non-conventional and conventional fields and at both regional and international levels. We consider this principle to be an essential prerequisite for the consideration of efforts towards nuclear disarmament or the humanitarian dimensions of nuclear weapons. Considering that these draft resolutions seek to keep a singular focus on one dimension of nuclear weapons to the exclusion of other legitimate aspects, to which we have drawn attention, our delegation was obliged to abstain on these texts.

In explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.44, entitled “Nuclear disarmament”, my delegation agrees with several elements of this draft resolution, including, inter alia, the call for the establishment of an ad hoc committee in the Conference on Disarmament on nuclear disarmament, the conclusion of a legally binding instrument on negative security assurances and the need to take into account the security interests of all States while negotiating disarmament treaties. However, we cannot

agree to the call for the full implementation of action plans of previous NPT Review Conferences in line with our well-known position on the NPT. We therefore abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

Paragraph 16 calls for the immediate commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) on the basis of the mandate contained in document CD/1299. It is indeed ironic that a draft resolution on nuclear disarmament continues to reflect only the non-proliferation-centric aspect of the FMCT negotiations. This anomaly notwithstanding, Pakistan, in line with its clear and unambiguous position on an FMCT, decided to vote against this paragraph.

In explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.46, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”, Pakistan has consistently supported the objectives of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). Accordingly we have been voting in favour of this draft resolution in this Committee and have done so this year as well. My delegation continues to believe that the objective of the call in the draft resolution for promoting signatures and ratification leading to the CTBT’s entry into force will be facilitated with major erstwhile proponents, when the major erstwhile proponents of the CTBT decide to ratify it. Acceptance of the CTBT obligations on a regional basis in South Asia will also help to expedite its entry into force.

The draft resolution welcomes the conclusions and recommendations of the last NPT Review Conference. We wish to reiterate that we do not consider ourselves bound by any of the provisions that emanate from NPT Review Conferences, nor any other forums in which Pakistan is not represented. Therefore while my delegation, in a spirit of flexibility, voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in this document as a whole, we were constrained to abstain on the sixth preambular paragraph.

In explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.51, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons”, Pakistan supports the goal of nuclear disarmament and the vision of a world without nuclear weapons. There are many elements of this draft resolution with which Pakistan is in agreement. We therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, our support for this draft resolution cannot be construed as our

endorsement of the outcomes of action plans of NPT Review Conferences.

The Chair: I accept the apologies of the representative of Pakistan, but must also convey them to the representative of France because we have now exhausted the time available to us for this meeting.

Delegations wishing to take the floor to explain their position after action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”, will have the opportunity to do so tomorrow morning before we take up other clusters.

I give the floor to the Secretary to read out the names of countries from which we now have requests for the floor for tomorrow morning. They will be called in the following order.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): We have requests to speak in explanation of vote after the vote on draft resolutions in cluster 1 in the following order: France, India, the Russian Federation, Japan, the United Kingdom, Israel, Spain, Germany, Bulgaria, Brazil, Finland, Norway, New Zealand, Cuba, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Switzerland, China and Sweden.

The Chair: Before adjourning, I now call on those delegations that have requested the floor to exercise their right of reply.

Mr. Sano (Japan): With regard to the continuous criticism of Japan by our Chinese and partly by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea colleagues, which focus on specific issues or a past event during the war, we believe it to be neither constructive nor productive, and even the rebuttal to each issue would not contribute to the discussion in the First Committee. Therefore my delegation will not respond to each point raised by these delegations.

It is now important for both China and Japan to establish a future-oriented relationship of cooperation in order to tackle the common challenges that face the international community.

Mr. Ibrahim (Syrian Arab Republic): It seems that the representative of the Israeli regime does not know the bloody history of her regime. Her regime is the biggest possessor of weapons of mass destruction in the region, in addition to nuclear weapons. Furthermore, her regime is the first user of biological and chemical weapons in the Middle East. I will give her a brief

history of what her regime has done since 1948. Israeli weapons of mass destruction started with the doctrine of David Ben Gurion, who said:

“The destruction of the Palestinian society in Palestine is a necessary condition for the establishment of the State of Israel on its ruins. If Palestinians cannot be removed by massacres and expulsion they shall be removed by extermination.”

In May 1948, Zionist gangs, then led by Ben Gurion himself, besieged the Palestinian city of Acre. To shorten the siege and to enter the city, the Zionist gangs injected typhoid into the water. Many Palestinians and some 55 British soldiers who were in that city got infected. The representative of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Mr. De Meuron, sent a series of reports from 6 to 19 May 1948, describing the conditions of the city population as struck by a sudden typhoid epidemic and requested efforts to combat it. The minutes of an emergency meeting between Mr. De Meuron and the British Medical Services officers stated that the infection was water-borne. To accomplish his extermination policy, Ben Gurion wrote a letter to Ehud Avriel, a member of the Jewish Agency in Europe, ordering him to recruit East European Jewish scientists who could either increase the capacity to kill masses or to cure masses, and he said “both are important”.

Experts in microbiology were recruited to form the science corps in the Haganah then, which is publicly now known as the Israel Institute for Biological Research (IIBR). For years, the IIBR developed chemical and biological weapons in secret until 4 October 1992, when El Al flight 1862 crashed into a high-rise apartment complex in a neighbourhood in Amsterdam in the Netherlands while on its way to Tel Aviv carrying three crew members, one passenger and 114 tons of freight. The crash killed at least 47 and destroyed the health of 3,000 Dutch residents. Cases of mysterious illnesses, rashes, difficulty in breathing, nervous disorders and cancer began to sprout in that neighbourhood.

After several years of deep investigation, Karl Knepp, a science editor at the Dutch daily *NRC Handelsblad*, in November 1999 published a report about the workings of the IIBR. The report revealed that the plane was carrying a shipment from Solkatrionic Chemicals from Morrisville, Pennsylvania, to IIBR under a United States Department of Commerce licence, in violation of the Chemical Weapons Convention. Among the shipments there were 50 gallons of

dimethyl methylphosphonate, a substance used to make a quarter-ton of the deadly nerve gas sarin. He also discovered links between the IIBR and other military and scientific institutions in other Western countries. Israel has also used weapons of mass destruction against the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza, against Lebanon and Gaza during military assaults in 2006 and during Operation Cast Lead against Gaza in 2008-2009.

During Israel's military assault on Gaza in the summer of 2006, doctors reported that dozens of victims had completely burned bodies and shrapnel-type injuries that X-ray machines had been unable to detect. Lengthy research and analysis of the samples of metals found in the victims' bodies and examination of the wounds led to the conclusion that the most likely cause was missiles very similar to the United States-made dense, inert metal explosives. Other victims were found to have traces of tungsten, a highly incendiary substance. Israel again used phosphorus shells, whose effects are extremely harmful, in the weeks-long aerial bombardment of the largely unarmed and defenceless civilian population during Operation Cast Lead in 2008-2009. The murderous assault on Gaza resulted in between 1,166 and 1,417 Palestinian deaths, with just 13 Israeli deaths.

The United Nations fact-finding report known as the Goldstone Report reiterated the findings of numerous other respected international studies confirming Israel's disproportionate use of force against the Palestinians and accusations against Israel of war crimes and possible crimes against humanity, including Israel's use of phosphorus. The report said that Israeli forces were systematically reckless in using white phosphorus in built-up areas, citing the Israeli attack on the United Nations Relief and Works Agency compound in Gaza City, the attack on Al-Quds hospital and the attack on Al-Wafa hospital.

What I have mentioned is self-explanatory and needs no further explanation.

The Chair: Before giving the floor to the next speaker, and in the light of the late hour and limited availability of interpretation, I appeal to delegations to refrain from making a second intervention in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. Fu Cong (China): I want to make two points in response to what the Japanese Ambassador has said. First, I should like to remind the Committee that it is Japan that has repeatedly raised the issue of past events, namely, those in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The reason China has responded so forcefully is to set the record right and to give the world the whole picture of what really happened during the Second World War.

Secondly, he mentioned that we need to look to the future. Indeed, we are ready to look to the future but that has to be based on a correct recognition of history, and actually at all levels and for a long period of time that is exactly what we have been urging the Japanese Government to do and what they have refused to do.

Ms. Rahaminoff-Honig (Israel): I will be brief. I should like to reject wholly and completely the statement made by the representative of Syria. The statement was made by a representative of a State which, over the course of the past several years, has caused the deaths and injuries of hundreds of thousands of people — its own people — by attacking them with missiles, chemical weapons, barrel bombs and many other means, and has caused the wide displacement of populations and other atrocities. Syria has been the subject of numerous resolutions of the Security Council, the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and the International Atomic Energy Agency for its non-compliance with its international obligations, and its representatives have absolutely no place to preach in this forum. Let them use their energies and efforts to look into their own conduct and better themselves.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.