



General Assembly

Seventy-second session

First Committee

24th meeting

Friday, 27 October 2017, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Bahr Aluloom (Iraq)

The meeting was called to order at 3 pm.

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

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

The Chair: The Committee will begin by hearing the remaining delegations that requested the floor to make explanations of vote before the vote on cluster 1, entitled “Nuclear weapons”.

Mr. Hassan (Egypt): I take the floor to explain Egypt’s position on three of the proposals presented to the First Committee for action under this cluster.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, Egypt finds itself obliged to abstain in the voting on the resolution, as a whole, as well as on some of its paragraphs. At the outset, my delegation would like to reiterate that we consider Japan, the main sponsor of the draft resolution, to be one of our key international partners, in particular in the area of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Egypt continues to appreciate the intended overall objective of the draft resolution, in terms of aiming at the total elimination of nuclear weapons. However, the overall message conveyed by the draft resolution continues to lean more towards implying that nuclear disarmament is mainly the responsibility of non-nuclear-weapon States, thereby justifying non-compliance with nuclear disarmament obligations.

Moreover, many paragraphs continue to fall far short, not only of Egypt’s expectations but also of

obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), in a manner that represents an alarming trend, in particular when we are in the middle of an already fragile NPT review cycle. With regard to the reference to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, Egypt firmly believes that, among the remaining States listed in annex 2, there is a clear special responsibility for the States that are not party to the NPT and the remaining nuclear-weapon States to sign and ratify the Treaty. Unfortunately, operative paragraph 21 did not observe that widely shared belief.

Operative paragraph 17 could be interpreted in a way that provides legitimacy for States that are not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to possess nuclear weapons. With regard to operative paragraph 28, we believe that including a reference to the additional protocol in a resolution that is mainly aimed at tackling nuclear disarmament only reinforces a reversed logic that aims to delay the implementation of nuclear-disarmament obligations and further add to the imbalances between nuclear-disarmament and non-proliferation obligations. Last but not least, we were disappointed that the draft resolution was subject to several negative amendments, in particular in operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 20. We sincerely hope that in future the sponsors of the draft resolution will take those concerns into consideration, strike a reasonable balance and strive to achieve consensus on this very important subject.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.42, entitled, “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty” (CTBT), Egypt will continue to vote in favour of the draft

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

17-34956 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



resolution as a whole, as a sign of its full commitment to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, and its continued support for the CTBT and its objectives. However, Egypt will once again abstain in the voting because of the fourth preambular paragraph of the resolution and its reference to Security Council resolution 2310 (2016), on which Egypt also abstained in the Security Council in 2016. It expressed in detail its substantive reservations on the content of the resolution.

Our abstention in the voting on the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.42 is based on Egypt's principled position on the practice of selectively resorting to the Security Council on matters that do not fall directly within the mandate of the Council in order to impose positions and obligations that should be negotiated in a more inclusive manner by all parties concerned. Egypt also continues to highlight the negative consequences of the practice of selective references to Security Council resolutions in the General Assembly's resolutions. We hope that that controversial reference to Security Council resolution 2310 (2016), which does not add any real value to the resolution, will be deleted in future in order to facilitate its adoption by consensus.

Finally, with regard to draft decision A/C.1/72/L.50, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other explosive devices", while Egypt intends to vote in favour of the document, it would like to reiterate that any future treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons must include clear commitments on the elimination of pre-existing stockpiles in a transparent, verifiable and irreversible manner that ensures that such a treaty aims achieving nuclear disarmament and not just non-proliferation, in order to avoid adding to the existing significant imbalances in that area. Egypt also reiterates that the Conference on Disarmament remains the most relevant venue for concluding such a treaty on the basis of document CD/1299.

Mr. Mendoza García (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): Costa Rica would like voice its position on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, entitled "United action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

Costa Rica has endorsed draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35 in the past, with a positive spirit, in line with our desire for a world without nuclear weapons. We share the concern of its sponsors about

the escalation of tensions on the Korean peninsula and subsequent threats to peace and security. My country has categorically condemned each nuclear test and ballistic-missile launch conducted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. This year, however, we cannot endorse draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, for the following reasons.

My country believes that 2017 marks a turning point in the quest for nuclear disarmament. The adoption of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons is a milestone that cannot go unnoticed. Costa Rica was honoured by the Conference to Negotiate a Legally Binding Instrument to Prohibit Nuclear Weapons, Leading Towards their Total Elimination, for its role in presiding over the Conference and concluding a Treaty that garnered the support of 122 countries. The Treaty now has 53 signatures and three ratifications. We therefore believe that it must be acknowledged as a key instrument that complements the disarmament machinery.

We also call the First Committee's attention to the fact that the Treaty has been undermined in other areas, such as through the use of moderate language on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, the lack of an unequivocal call for the destruction of nuclear stockpiles and disregard for the security conditions required to achieve disarmament. We will therefore abstain in the voting on the draft resolution. We hope that in future we will again be able to support draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35. We will therefore continue to be open to engaging in constructive dialogue and cooperating with all States Members of the United Nations in the quest for nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Deyneko (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): As controversial draft resolutions began to emerge, we warned their authors about the possible disastrous consequences of developing other options. Regrettably, our concerns have now become all too real. The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons has not yet entered into force, but the differences among States with regard to its provisions have reached a boiling point. The mere increase in the number of parallel structures does not alter the essence of the processes already under way throughout the world. It simply takes us further from the noble goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world. In that regard, we object to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.45, and specifically the proposal that an international United Nations conference on nuclear disarmament be convened in 2018.

With regard to A/C.1/72/L.6, in our opinion the conclusion of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons is a mistake. Such a document undermines the foundations of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and cannot promote the process of nuclear disarmament. The document drafted contradicts the agreements reached under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or the 2010 action plan. The prohibition of nuclear weapons is considered exclusively through the prism of humanitarian, moral and ethical imperatives, and is detached from current developments in the world in which we live. From the very start, the negotiations process was based on unacceptable parameters. The mandate included the possibility of reaching decisions through a vote, ignoring the obvious principle that reaching an agreement on issues pertaining to vital security interests cannot be achieved other than by consensus. We will not sign the Treaty because it disregards our national interests. From Russia's perspective, therefore, the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons is not in line with international customary law.

Genuine progress in the area of nuclear disarmament can be achieved only by ensuring equal and indivisible security for all States, without exception, taking into account the sum total of factors that influence global stability and international security. It is a step-by-step process that must absolutely involve all States that possess a military nuclear potential. We could have welcomed the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, congratulated participants on the successful conclusion of negotiations and proposed that, from now on, all discussions in the area of nuclear disarmament be conducted exclusively within the framework of a treaty that was so respected it prevailed over any other instrument. In that regard, any discussion of nuclear disarmament within the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Conference on Disarmament and the United Nations Disarmament Commission can be stopped, as our anti-nuclear-weapon activists would supposedly already have resolved all issues among themselves, without our involvement.

We will not do that, however, because for us, nuclear disarmament is not a dead letter. It is a process that has endured for decades. It has spared us and all of humankind from total annihilation. We approach nuclear disarmament with great earnest and responsibility. We are fully aware of the complexity and value of

each genuine and effective agreement, rather than the empty shell of one. We call on all members of the international community to engage in responsible and constructive dialogue on issues pertaining to nuclear disarmament, global security and strategic stability in order to develop truly effective measures towards a world without nuclear weapons, on the basis of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, an earlier universal instrument adopted by consensus. We are also open to new initiatives that — not only in word, but also in deed — might help to consolidate rather than to fragment international efforts.

Based on those considerations, Russia will vote against draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.4, A/C.1/72/L.5, A/C.1/72/L.6, A/C.1/72/L.17, A/C.1/72/L.18, A/C.1/72/L.19, A/C.1/72/L.28, A/C.1/72/L.45 and A/C.1/72/L.57.

Mr. Ri Im Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to reaffirm our position before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, entitled "United action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons" and sponsored by Japan.

My delegation underscores that Japan's political reasoning behind draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35 is impure. Furthermore, the tenth and eleventh preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 19, 24 and 25 of the draft resolution are unacceptable to us because they jeopardize our supreme interests. My delegation believes that the draft resolution put forward by Japan is full of prejudice, distortion and hypocrisy, and will therefore vote against it. We will also vote against draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.19 and A/C.1/72/L.42, which encroach on our supreme interests.

Mr. Gómez Camacho (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mexico will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35 because it understands its authors' motivations and challenges. Nonetheless, the draft resolution includes a large number of substantive changes that affect its balance and meaning. The draft resolution makes reference to the various approaches that have undermined trust within the international community and states that that trust must be restored before progress can be made in the area of nuclear disarmament. That assertion contradicts the plurality of the General Assembly's work and implies that certain developments, including the negotiation, conclusion and adoption of the Treaty on the Prohibition of

Nuclear Weapons, will hamper progress in the area of nuclear disarmament.

Mexico does not agree with that statement. All States must do their utmost to maintain peace. To that end, we must honour our international commitments, without conditions. For those reasons, Mexico would like to underscore its concerns about a few paragraphs in draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35.

First, paragraph 2 reinterprets the unequivocal commitment made by the nuclear-weapon States at the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and reiterated in the 2010 action plan on the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals, in line with their obligations under article VI of the Treaty.

Secondly, paragraph 10 includes new language that demands that all States reduce international tensions to create the conditions for nuclear-weapon States to continue reducing their nuclear-weapon stockpiles.

Thirdly, paragraph 14 limits the issuance of negative security assurances only to non-nuclear-weapon States that are party to the NPT, and in compliance with their obligations under the Treaty.

Fourthly, the nineteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 8, as a whole, alter the nature of concerns about the catastrophic effects of nuclear weapons. In that regard, for Mexico, the adoption of that resolution should not set a precedent for the level of ambition and demands we will continue to issue to States with regard to compliance with international agreements. The language used in the draft resolution cannot be considered an alternative or a substitute to what was agreed by the parties to the NPT.

Ms. Higge (New Zealand): I take the floor to explain New Zealand's position on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, entitled "United action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

New Zealand has voted in favour of the previous versions of the draft resolution that have been presented to the First Committee. However, we note with disappointment that this year's text represents a fundamental departure from that of its predecessors. Some of its language risks fracturing the widespread and long-standing agreements on certain fundamental aspects of the international community's approach to nuclear disarmament, notably with regard to the standing

and integrity of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and its Review Conference process, and in relation to the importance of the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35 has redrafted important outcomes and undertakings made in the context of the NPT and which are pivotal to the health of that regime. Notwithstanding, its condemnation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and its call for North Korea to desist from nuclear-weapon testing and to join the CTBT — elements that New Zealand continues to support most strongly — and despite the recent welcome efforts of the delegation of Japan to improve the text of paragraph 21, draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35 fails to emphasize the vital importance of the CTBT's entry into force and to urge the removal of all obstacles in its way.

As a committed supporter of both those Treaties, New Zealand cannot support any draft resolution, however well-meaning its sponsors, that risks undermining the fundamental importance of the NPT and the CTBT to the international community's long-standing efforts to advance nuclear disarmament and support non-proliferation. New Zealand also notes with concern the divergence of the text of A/C.1/72/L.35 from the language of the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons initiative. Accordingly, New Zealand will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35.

Ms. Bila (Ukraine): Ukraine has always been a strong adherent of nuclear disarmament. We voluntarily accepted a ban on nuclear weapons before the negotiations on a treaty to ban nuclear weapons started. Back in 1994, we joined the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear-weapon State. It would be difficult to find another State that is more opposed to nuclear weapons than Ukraine. At the same time, we will abstain in the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.19 and A/C.1/72/L.6, which include references to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. While fully supporting the goals of the Treaty, we are persuaded that it is premature to sign that document.

We are convinced that the NPT is the cornerstone of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Unfortunately, in recent years, the NPT has become extremely fragile. The Democratic People's Republic of

Korea and the Russian Federation are in violation of the NPT. Early in January 2003, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea stated that it could no longer be bound by the NPT and started its nuclear programme. The Russian Federation remains a party to the NPT but blatantly violates its provisions. By starting military aggression against Ukraine, the Russians violated not only the Budapest memorandum, but also the NPT itself.

The preamble to the NPT clearly states that, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, States must refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. In such situations, the only way forward for all peaceful nations is to unite their efforts and oppose the aggressive policy of both States infringing the NPT, namely the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation. Full NPT implementation is the only way to successful nuclear disarmament. It has a strong verification regime and regulates the issue of the peaceful use of nuclear energy. The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons undermines the credibility of the NPT. The failure of the NPT could be disastrous for the entire international community.

Mr. Méndez Graterol (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): Our delegation takes the floor to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, entitled "United action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", put forward by the delegation of Japan.

In the past, our country voted in favour of the previous versions of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35. From the start, it has believed that cooperation and joint efforts among States with a view to making substantive headway in the area of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation are the way to achieve a world without nuclear weapons. The catastrophic power of nuclear weapons is a serious threat to the human species. We know that the current political tensions in various regions of the planet and the belligerent narrative of some nuclear-weapon States have increased the risks of a clash that could have disastrous consequences for humankind. That is why we are concerned about the approach that Japan has taken this year to the text of the draft resolution, deleting agreed language with regard to commitments to achieving the goal of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

In that regard, we are concerned about the fact that the language agreed upon in previous draft resolutions has been deleted from paragraph 2. Such language reaffirmed the unequivocal commitment of nuclear-weapon States to completely eliminating their nuclear-weapon arsenals with a view to achieving nuclear disarmament, in line with article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The new draft resolution recognizes only the commitment of nuclear-weapon States to non-proliferation and removes the reference to nuclear disarmament, thereby disregarding the commitment agreed upon by those States under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

With regard to paragraphs 19 and 21 on the moratorium on nuclear tests outlined in the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), our country acknowledges that the paragraphs in question blame only one country in particular for the current status of the Treaty, thereby making its content unclear and undermining the language of the CTBT. Its entry into force will be possible only when that country signs and ratifies the Treaty. Our delegation will therefore abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, because of the inconsistencies that it has outlined.

Mr. Abbani (Algeria) (*spoke in Arabic*): I take the floor to explain my position on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, entitled "United action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". My country's position remains the same on the other draft resolutions that will be put to a vote.

At the outset, let me thank the delegation of Japan and other delegations for their efforts to draft the text. We would have liked our colleagues and friends who co-authored this draft resolution to convene consultations on the text so as to hear our many objective concerns about the substantive amendments to the text. They are not simple amendments that do not require discussion. Several are vital to the draft resolution and should have encouraged the Japanese delegation to convene consultations to hear our comments and respond to our concerns with a view to reaching consensus. Since it first appeared on the General Assembly's agenda, this text has strayed increasingly further, year after year, from the principled positions that Algeria has always expressed and upheld. The draft resolution is no longer balanced.

We underscore that draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35 in its present form strays from several principles and

commitments. That is clearly evident in the paragraphs related to the non-proliferation commitments upon which we agreed at several Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, as well as in the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. Those paragraphs do not reflect our national objectives, as a party to all major disarmament and non-proliferation-related treaties.

Paragraph 2 of the draft resolution does not refer to the commitments agreed upon under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We are categorically opposed to it because it contradicts the principles of the NPT. In addition, unlike in previous years, the draft resolution does not call for all annex 2 States, without exception, to sign the Treaty. That undermines our regular calls for those States to sign the Treaty and allow its entry into force. We are dismayed that the draft resolution does not reflect united action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons. It is for that reason that Algeria will vote in favour of paragraphs put to the vote, with the exception of paragraph 2, and will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

In conclusion, we thank the delegation of Japan for its efforts, and we hope that our observations will be taken into consideration during the drafting of next year's text. Members of the Committee may rest assured that my delegation is ready to work with other delegations to contribute to those efforts.

Mr. Weinoh (Nigeria): My delegation would like to make a few remarks on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35.

At the outset, it is important to place on record the fact that last year my delegation co-sponsored the draft resolution entitled "United action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons" because of our belief that it encompassed Nigeria's core principles on nuclear disarmament. However, my delegation was dismayed to discover the introduction of new language that fails to reflect the great language used in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, including the time-honoured elements of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

My delegation is of the view that voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35 would be at variance with Nigeria's core principles on nuclear disarmament. Such a move would be tantamount to making a joke of

renewed efforts on the determination by the majority of those here today who have tirelessly made every effort to negotiate and adopt the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. More than 35 States have signed the Treaty so far. Nigeria remains proud to be associated with that process. Specifically, after a careful analysis of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, Nigeria's reservation is premised on the fact that the text does not mention the adoption of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. It is inconceivable not to refer to a legally binding international instrument adopted and signed by the majority of States represented here today.

The text has watered down existing commitments and could lead to States questioning their current obligations, thereby undermining existing instruments, such as the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. The current version of the text has been substantially changed. The former version has been altered and consensus language has been replaced. The new draft offers a new narrative and is prone to hinder, instead of encourage, nuclear disarmament.

While certain elements of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35 are in concert with Nigeria's ideals, overall, it seems to undercut the spirit of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. In view of the foregoing, Nigeria will abstain in the voting on the resolution, as a whole.

Ms. Altangerel (Mongolia): I would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, entitled "United action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

Mongolia fully shares the objective of this traditional text in terms of general and complete disarmament aimed at creating a world free of nuclear weapons. However, my delegation will abstain in the voting on the nineteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 2 and 8. Specifically, we are concerned that changing the language agreed upon at the Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, omitting a reference to article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and changing agreed language on the humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons in the draft resolution significantly limits and weakens the text. We hope that next year's draft resolution will take

into consideration our concerns and reservations in that regard.

Mr. Masmejean (Switzerland): I take the floor for a joint explanation of vote by Sweden and Switzerland on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, entitled “United action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”.

We have long supported the text of the draft resolution. We continue to share the general objectives of the text to unite as broad a membership as possible around common considerations and measures to make inclusive progress towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons. While we will vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, our delegations feel compelled to place on record a number of fundamental concerns that we have about several elements in this year’s draft resolution.

We understand and support the inclusion of more affirmative language regarding the development of the nuclear-weapon and ballistic-missile programmes of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, which pose a grave global threat. We regret, however, that the goal of achieving the total elimination of nuclear disarmament is now conditioned by new considerations and that a number of key nuclear disarmament commitments are not accurately reflected.

We have significant concerns in particular about a number of paragraphs that could be understood by some as qualifying or interpreting the provisions of the consensus documents adopted at successive Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). That applies in particular to paragraph 2. We believe that the unequivocal undertaking of nuclear-weapon States to achieve the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals, leading to nuclear disarmament, to which all States parties are committed under article VI, which is part of both the 2000 and 2010 NPT final documents, remains fully valid. The draft resolution cannot be taken as reinterpreting or rewriting that vital undertaking or the corresponding disarmament obligations under international law. In the light of the need to facilitate our continued support for the text, we fully expect that paragraph 2 will be revised when the text is submitted in future.

Similar concerns and considerations apply to other paragraphs of the resolution, notably the nineteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 8.

While we continue to fully support language on the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons, we will abstain in the voting because the language deviates from that agreed by the 2010 NPT Review Conference, which expressed deep concern about the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. That applies to all NPT States parties. Similar concerns also apply to paragraphs 10, 13, 14 and 21; this list is not exhaustive. Actions set forth in the NPT stand on their own and cannot be made dependent upon new conditionalities.

We take this opportunity to state clearly that Sweden and Switzerland will firmly oppose any attempt to reinterpret, reverse or rewrite previous outcomes in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. We are convinced that, now more than ever, it is essential to stay the course in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and to stand by agreed road maps and principles. We stand ready to continue to work closely with all sponsors of the draft resolution in view of uniting the membership of the United Nations, notably to achieve concrete outcomes at the 2020 NPT Review Conference.

I shall now speak in my capacity as the representative of Switzerland to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”.

I wish to highlight that Switzerland gave explanations of vote in the past on this recurring resolution, which remain fully valid and continue to apply.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting on cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions under cluster 1.

We shall first take a decision on A/C.1/72/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.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.1 was submitted by the representative of Egypt on 29 September. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.1.

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

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East.”

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.2 was submitted by the representative of Egypt, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the League of Arab States, on 3 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.2.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.2. I shall put these paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg,

Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Democratic People's Republic of Korea

The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 164 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote the sixth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau,

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

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Democratic People's Republic of Korea

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 164 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.2, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, 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, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic

People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, India, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.2, as a whole, was adopted by 150 votes to 4, with 19 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.4, 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:

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.4 was submitted by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, on 2 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/72/L.4.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested for the sixth preambular paragraph.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 115 votes to 5, with 47 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.4, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

(Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, 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, Austria, China, Finland, Georgia, India, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Pakistan, Panama, Samoa, San Marino, Switzerland, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.4, as a whole, was adopted by 112 votes to 44, with 15 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.5, entitled “Humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.5 was submitted by the representative of Austria on 6 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.5. The additional sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.5 is Paraguay.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, 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, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea,

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.5 was adopted by 134 votes to 15, with 25 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.6, entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee. **Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.6 was submitted by the representative of Austria on 6 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.6.

I will first read out an oral statement with regard to the draft resolution.

The present statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. By paragraph 14 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.6, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services as may be necessary to fulfil the tasks entrusted to him by the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. In accordance with paragraph 1 of article 9, the costs of the meetings of States parties, the review conferences and the extraordinary meetings of States parties shall be borne by the States parties and States not party to the Treaty participating therein as observers, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment adjusted appropriately. Following the established practice, the Secretariat will prepare respective cost estimates for the approval of the States parties to assess the requirements for conference facilities and services.

In accordance with paragraph 2 of article 9 of the Treaty, the costs incurred by the Secretary-General in the circulation of declarations under article 2, reports under article 4 and proposed amendments under article 10 of this Treaty shall be borne by the States parties in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment adjusted appropriately.

It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties, under their respective legal arrangements, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations. Those activities will undertaken by the Secretariat only after sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties and States not party to the convention participating in the meetings. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.6 would not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

That brings me to the end of the oral statement.

The additional sponsor of A/C.1/72/L.6 is Uganda.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Belarus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Finland, Kyrgyzstan, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.6 was adopted by 118 votes to 39, with 11 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements

to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons”, as orally revised.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.10/Rev.1 was submitted by the representative of Pakistan on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.10/Rev.1. The main sponsor has informed the secretariat of the following oral revision to the text. The revised first preambular paragraph is to read as follows,

“Bearing in mind the need to allay the legitimate concern of the States of the world with regard to ensuring lasting security for their peoples.”

The additional sponsors for draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.10/Rev.1 are Kuwait, the Plurinational State of Bolivia and Uganda.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.10/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.10/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 118 votes to none, with 59 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.17, entitled “Ethical imperatives for a nuclear-weapon-free world”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.17 was submitted by the representative of South Africa on 10 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.17. The additional sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.17 is Benin.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the eleventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.17.

I shall now put to the vote the eleventh preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, 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, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

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

The eleventh preambular paragraph was retained by 118 votes to 37, with 11 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.17 as a whole, as amended.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, 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, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, 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, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.17, as a whole, was adopted by 122 votes to 36, with 14 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.19, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.19 was submitted by the representative of Mexico, on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition, on 10 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.19. The additional sponsor is Namibia.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 14 and 22 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.19. I shall first put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I shall now put to the vote the tenth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

The tenth preambular paragraph was retained by 118 votes to 37, with 10 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 14.

A recorded vote was taken. In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, 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, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana,

Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Bhutan, France, Germany, Hungary, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 14 was retained by 157 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 22.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic,

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

Operative paragraph 22 was retained by 121 votes to 37, with 10 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.19, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus,

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Finland, Iceland, Japan, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.19, as a whole, was adopted by 127 votes to 32, with 14 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.22, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.22 was submitted by the representative of India on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.22.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.22, as a whole, was adopted by 116 votes to 49, with 10 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28 was submitted by the representative of Brazil on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.28. The additional sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28 is Nigeria.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 121 votes to 35, with 11 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28, as a whole, was adopted by 142 votes to 4, with 29 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, entitled "United

action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", as orally revised.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35 was submitted by the representative of Japan on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.35.

The main sponsor has informed the secretariat of the following oral revision to operative paragraph 21, which now reads:

"Acknowledges the widespread call for the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, while recalling that all States, in particular the eight remaining States in annex 2 thereof, have been urged to take individual initiatives to sign and ratify that Treaty without waiting for any other State to do so, and the immediate commencement of negotiations on a Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices".

The additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35 are the United Arab Emirates and Equatorial Guinea.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the nineteenth and twentieth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 2, 5, 8, 20, 21 and 28.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

South Africa

Abstaining:

Angola, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, Ireland, Israel, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Mongolia, Namibia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Sweden, Switzerland, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

The nineteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 147 votes to 1, with 19 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote the twentieth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Russian Federation, South Africa

Abstaining:

Angola, China, France, Israel, Lesotho, Liberia, Monaco, Namibia, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

The twentieth preambular paragraph was retained by 155 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, 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, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Austria, Ecuador, Liechtenstein, Myanmar, New Zealand, South Africa, Switzerland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Namibia, Pakistan, Russian Federation, San Marino, Sweden, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 128 votes to 7, with 27 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 5.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, 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, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Israel, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Angola, Bhutan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Operative paragraph 5 was retained by 161 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 8.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Russian Federation, South Africa

Abstaining:

Angola, China, France, Ireland, Israel, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Monaco, Mongolia, Namibia, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 8 was retained by 149 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 20.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom

of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Myanmar, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Angola, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Liberia, Namibia, Thailand, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 20 was retained by 155 votes to 4, with 11 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 21, as orally revised.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, the

former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Austria, Liechtenstein, Myanmar, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Angola, Brazil, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Liberia, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Namibia, Nigeria, Switzerland, Thailand, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 21, as orally revised, was retained by 143 votes to 4, with 22 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 28.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman,

Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Myanmar

Abstaining:

Angola, Brazil, Egypt, India, Israel, Liberia, Pakistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 28 was retained by 155 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, as orally revised, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, 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, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States

of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Algeria, Austria, Brazil, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Mauritius, Myanmar, Namibia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, San Marino, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35 as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted by 144 votes to 4, with 27 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.36, entitled, "International Day against Nuclear Tests".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.36 was submitted by the representative of Kazakhstan on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.36. The additional sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.36 is Azerbaijan.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.36 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.36 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.37, entitled “African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.37 was submitted on 12 October 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 document A/C.1/72/L.37. The additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.37 are the Gambia, the Niger, Guinea and Gabon.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.37 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.37 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.38, entitled “Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.38 was submitted on 12 October 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 document A/C.1/72/L.38. The additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.38 are The Gambia, Gabon and Guinea.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.38 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.38 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.42, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.42 was submitted by the

representatives of Mexico, Australia and New Zealand on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.42. The additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.42 are Zambia and Guinea.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the fourth and seventh preambular paragraphs of draft resolution. I shall put these paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland,

Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Brazil, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mauritius, Nicaragua, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America

The fourth preambular paragraph was retained by 164 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote the seventh preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, 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, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, 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, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Israel, Mauritius, Pakistan, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 167 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.42, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

India, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.42, as a whole, was adopted by 174 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.47, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.47 was submitted by the representative of India on 13 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.47. The additional sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.47 is Guinea-Bissau.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.47 was adopted by 115 votes to 50, with 11 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft decision A/C.1/72/L.50, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/72/L.50 was submitted by the representative of Canada on 13 October. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.50.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, 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, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania,

Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Pakistan

Abstaining:

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

Draft decision A/C.1/72/L.50 was adopted by 174 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft decision A/C.1/72/L.55, entitled "Nuclear disarmament verification".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/72/L.55 was submitted by the representative of Norway on 13 October. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.55.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.55 has expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/72/L.55 was adopted.

The Chair: I now give the floor to those delegations that wish to explain their vote or position after the voting.

Mr. Jadoon (Pakistan): We delivered our explanation of vote yesterday, 26 October, on seven draft resolutions that have been adopted today: draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.2, A/C.1/72/L.4, A/C.1/72/L.5, A/C.1/72/L.6, A/C.1/72/L.17, A/C.1/72/L.42 and A/C.1/72/L.47. I have requested the floor to explain

my delegation's vote on five draft resolutions that were also adopted today: A/C.1/72/L.19, A/C.1/72/L.28 and A/C.1/72/L.35, and draft decisions A/C.1/72/L.50 and A/C.1/72/L.55.

First, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.19, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", Pakistan is committed to the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world through the conclusion of a universal, verifiable, non-discriminatory and comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons in the Conference on Disarmament, consistent with the universally agreed principles in the consensus outcome document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S/10-2). Pakistan acknowledges the value of several aspects of resolution A/C.1/72/L.19. However, we are dismayed by the ritualistic and unrealistic call upon Pakistan in paragraph 14 to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as a non-nuclear-weapon State. As a non-party to the NPT, we cannot subscribe to the conclusions and decisions of its review conferences.

With regard to the references in draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.19, while welcoming the adoption of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, we would like to recall that Pakistan did not take part in the negotiations of that Treaty due to the various glaring procedural and substantive shortcomings of the process, which we have highlighted on different occasions. In the light of those considerations, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution, as a whole, and on its tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 20, and voted against operative paragraph 14.

Secondly, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", we agree with its primary aim and focus and therefore voted in favour of it. However, we were constrained to abstain in the voting on its sixth preambular paragraph, which references a divisive and non-universal initiative. Pakistan did not take part in the negotiations on the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, due to its various glaring procedural and substantive shortcomings, which we have highlighted on different occasions.

Thirdly, with regard to A/C.1/72/L.35, entitled "United action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", Pakistan

supports the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons — a key goal of that draft resolution. We remain committed to the achievement of a nuclear-weapon-free world, through the conclusion of a universal, verifiable and non-discriminatory comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons in the Conference on Disarmament. Pakistan is not a party to the NPT and is therefore not bound by its provisions. We accordingly do not subscribe to the conclusions and recommendations emanating from its various review conferences. In addition, the International Atomic Energy Agency comprehensive safeguards agreement applies only to those States that have consented to assume that legal obligation under the NPT.

We are also concerned that a draft resolution seeking united action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons seeks only to address the non-proliferation aspect of fissile materials. Moreover, the divisive call for commencing negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) has been included in paragraph 21. It also calls for the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). My delegation would not have objected to the call for the CTBT's entry into force if it had been pronounced in a stand-alone paragraph, without being conflated with the divisive and controversial FMCT. In view of those considerations, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, as a whole, as well as on paragraphs 2 and 28, and voted against paragraphs 5, 20 and 21.

Fourthly, with regard to draft decision A/C.1/72/L.50, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", the consistent and principled position of my delegation on the FCMT is well known. A treaty banning the future production of fissile material, as envisaged under the Shannon mandate and again endorsed by that draft decision, would simply freeze the status quo and neither effectively serve the objective of disarmament nor that of non-proliferation. By perpetuating the asymmetries in the global existing stocks of fissile material, it would be detrimental to global and regional strategic stability. In South Asia, such a cut-off treaty would only worsen the strategic imbalance already being exacerbated by the continued exercise of double standards.

Similar to Pakistan's stance towards the ill-advised Group of Governmental Experts established in 2014, Pakistan has again chosen not to participate in the

so-called high-level FMCT expert preparatory group. Pakistan engaged with the lead sponsors of the relevant resolution last year in a constructive spirit by offering textual proposals aimed at starting substantive work on a truly non-discriminatory treaty that addresses both the future and past production of fissile material. Regrettably, the sponsors expressed their inability to take those suggestions on board and persisted with a tried-and-tested failed approach. The limited and incomplete composition of the so-called high-level FMCT expert preparatory group, as well as its divisive genesis, restrictive mandate and partial basis of work, does not qualify it to undertake the task that has been mandated to it. We will not be in a position to accept any conclusion or recommendation produced by that expert group, including any attempt to force its report on the Conference on Disarmament. Progress on Conference on Disarmament-related issues can be achieved neither by changing the format or forum, nor by imposing solutions that exclude major stakeholders. That left us with no option but to vote against draft decision A/C.1/72/L.50.

Lastly, with regard to draft decision A/C.1/72/L.55, entitled “Nuclear disarmament verification”, my delegation joined the consensus on it. We recognized that the process of multilateral nuclear disarmament, involving the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons, would be a complex undertaking. Verification would be an essential and key component of such a process. To a large degree, its credibility would rest on an effective and independent verification mechanism to be agreed to the satisfaction of all parties during negotiations. The negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-weapons convention should be undertaken holistically and not pursued piecemeal. Nonetheless, we see the value in doing some expert work on the issue of verification in a representative forum that includes all the relevant stakeholders.

In our view, the more suitable forum for that work is the Conference on Disarmament. We proposed an amendment to that effect to the sponsors of resolution 71/67 last year. However, they decided to choose to mandate a 25-member group of governmental experts to conduct that work. To demonstrate our flexibility, my delegation decided to vote in favour of that resolution in the General Assembly last year, although we had abstained in the voting on it in the First Committee. Our decision to vote in favour arose from our desire to make a practical contribution to the cause of nuclear

disarmament. In that context, we hope to be a part of the group of governmental experts that is being established pursuant to the resolution.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): My delegation was pleased to again join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.1, entitled “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East”. We support the important goals of that draft resolution and the consensus-based spirit in which it was pursued this year. We note, however, that, with respect to the eighth preambular paragraph, we do not consider the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons to constitute an initiative leading to general and complete disarmament.

I am now speaking on behalf of the United Kingdom, France and the United States, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28, entitled “Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas”. We would like to emphasize the importance we attach to the development, where appropriate, of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones. Such zones can make an important contribution to regional and global security, provided that they are established as set out in the 1999 United Nations Disarmament Commission guidelines. In particular, they must be freely arrived at by all States of the region concerned; verified, *inter alia*, through comprehensive safeguards applied by the International Atomic Energy Agency; and concluded in consultation with the nuclear-weapon States.

We continue to believe that it is contradictory to propose the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone that would be composed largely of the high seas, while simultaneously claiming that it would be fully consistent with applicable principles and rules of international law, including those of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, relating to the freedom of the high seas, and the right of passage through maritime space. It appears to us that the real goal of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28 is the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone covering the high seas. We do not believe that that ambiguity has been sufficiently clarified.

Finally, we note that this year’s draft resolution welcomes the adoption of the text of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. Neither we nor any other nuclear-weapon State or nuclear-weapon-possessing State participated in the negotiation

of that Treaty, which we oppose. It is for those reasons that we voted against the draft resolution.

Mr. Luque Márquez (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I take the floor in explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.42 and A/C.1/72/L.47.

On several occasions, Ecuador has underscored the need for the urgent entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). Ecuador has not just called for ratification of the Treaty; it ratified it on 12 November 2001 and completed the establishment of a radionuclide station and an infrasound monitoring station in the Galapagos Islands a few months ago, in accordance with our obligations under the Treaty. Ecuador's vote to retain the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.42 demonstrated its firm support for the universal call for its entry into force.

Likewise, my delegation deplores the fact that that paragraph continues to reference Security Council resolution 2310 (2016). For Ecuador, resolution 2310 (2016) was an attempt by the Security Council to meddle in the functioning of the Treaty, which was opened for signature by the General Assembly, in line with its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, and whose universalization is facilitated by a Preparatory Commission and a temporary technical secretariat, which is also mandated to develop a verification regime for the Treaty's entry into force.

The adoption of resolution 2310 (2016) by the Security Council was an attempt on its part to establish the right to interfere in the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty that is not provided for in the Treaty. Let us be clear — none of the provisions of the Charter grants the Security Council the right to interfere in the work of international instruments. Article 13 of the Charter does, however, grant the General Assembly that right. The adoption of resolution 2310 (2016) will therefore not accelerate the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty or facilitate the work of its verification regime. The Treaty will enter into force when all annex 2 States that have not yet done so sign or ratify it, including those members of the Security Council that promoted and supported resolution 2310 (2016). Let us reject the distractions. The eight annex 2 States that have not ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty should sign or ratify it so as to enable its entry into force.

In addition, I must also recall that paragraph 4 of Security Council resolution 2310 (2016) references the

Joint Statement on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty by China, the United States of America, the Russian Federation, France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of 15 September 2016, which includes erroneous claims to a non-existent right to maintain their nuclear arsenals, and is at variance with their obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the CTBT. We reiterate our request that references to Security Council resolution 2310 (2016) be omitted the next time the draft text is presented, as such references do not contribute to, facilitate or accelerate the CTBT's entry into force.

Ecuador voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.47, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", because we support all sincere efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons. Although we thank the main sponsor of the draft resolution for its indirect references to the recent adoption of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, we would have preferred direct references to the Treaty to have been included in the draft resolution. In addition, we must recall that the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, with 53 signatures and three ratifications, which we hope will enter into force in a few months, is a universal legally binding instrument that is open for signature by all States and already expressly bans the use and threat of use of nuclear weapons. The way forward for us therefore is to universalize the existing Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, while preventing duplication of effort.

Ms. Hallin (Sweden): I take the floor on behalf of Switzerland and my own country, Sweden, to give context to our delegations' votes in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.6, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations".

Mindful of the urgent need to make progress on nuclear disarmament and willing to explore initiatives to that end, our countries participated actively in the negotiations on the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons earlier this year. Such negotiations were motivated, in large part, by the humanitarian concerns posed by nuclear weapons. Our main motivation was to seek ways to overcome the status quo, with all its attendant nuclear-related risks. Our support for the adoption of the Treaty at the end of negotiations was indicative of our hope that it would contribute to efforts to achieve a world without nuclear weapons. Looking ahead, and as Switzerland and Sweden made clear on

7 July, both countries will conduct thorough national assessments of the Treaty's implications on a wide range of issues, including disarmament, broader security and defence cooperation, as well as legal matters, before a decision can be made on possible future signature or accession.

The analysis will logically address our well-known concerns on specific provisions of the Treaty, in particular with regard to its complementarity with existing instruments and the verifiability of the prohibition. Indeed, a key consideration for us throughout the negotiations process was the need to ensure that the Prohibition Treaty is fully compatible with and complements the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as the cornerstone of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. That perspective, however, is not clearly articulated in the text. To us, few things will be more important in the years ahead than ensuring a constructive review cycle, paving the way for a Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT in 2020 with a concrete outcome.

Another important area of concern for us is verification provisions, which should have been more robust, and reflect that the International Atomic Energy Agency additional protocol is the appropriate verification standard for such an instrument, or, at least, a standard for which we must strive. While conducting those national evaluations, our countries will also follow closely the impact of the Treaty, as well as how its provisions are interpreted. Those considerations on A/C.1/72/L.6 also apply to other draft resolutions referring to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

While I have the floor, I would also like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.17, entitled "Ethical imperatives for a nuclear-weapon-free world". Switzerland and Sweden made a joint explanation of vote on that draft resolution in the past, which remains valid.

Let me conclude by emphasizing our country's commitment to continue working towards a nuclear-weapon-free world. We call upon all States to take a forward-looking perspective and to work together to overcome the existing polarization.

Mr. Garrido Melo (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to explain Chile's vote on draft resolutions

A/C.1/72/L.35 and A/C.1/72/L.47, which were adopted today.

Chile voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, as a whole, entitled "United action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", under agenda item 99 (z). My country attaches utmost importance to efforts to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons. It also shares concerns about and underscores its condemnation of the nuclear and ballistic-missile programme of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which is undoubtedly a grave threat to international peace and security. Nonetheless, Chile abstained in the voting on operative paragraphs relating to the central role of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In addition, we do not join in the attempts to lay down conditions for the fulfilment of obligations outlined in the Treaty or to change the language agreed to at its Review Conferences.

To that end, my country would like to make it very clear that nuclear weapons do not play a security role and that the reduction of nuclear arsenals can never be conditional upon particular international circumstances that have not been specified. Chile will continue to champion the cause of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, whose possession, use and threat of use have been banned by the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, which was recently negotiated and adopted by the majority of the States of the General Assembly.

Chile voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.47, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", under agenda item 100 (a). My country shares concerns that the use of nuclear weapons is the most serious threat to the survival of humankind. Nonetheless, Chile firmly believes that the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, negotiated by the majority of States represented here today and opened for signature on 20 September, which Chile signed, adequately addresses the concerns expressed in this resolution to ban not only the use, but also the threat of use and the possession of nuclear weapons. For Chile, the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, because of its relevance and legitimacy, along with the Charter of the United Nations and international humanitarian law, is a vital legal framework for proscribing the use of nuclear weapons, under all circumstances.

Mr. Gill (India): I beg the indulgence and attention of fellow representatives as I explain my delegation's votes on A/C.1/72/L.2, A/C.1/72/L.4, A/C.1/72/L.5, A/C.1/72/L.6, A/C.1/72/L.17, A/C.1/72/L.18, A/C.1/72/L.19, A/C.1/72/L.35 and A/C.1/72/L.37.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", India believes that the focus of that draft resolution should be limited to the region that it intends to address. India's position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is well known. The 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which codified the prevailing customary international law, provides that States are bound by a treaty, based on the principle of free consent. The call to those States remaining outside the NPT to accede to it and to accept International Atomic Energy Agency comprehensive safeguards on all their nuclear facilities is at variance with that principle and does not reflect current realities. India is not a party to the NPT and is not bound by its outcome documents. That also applies to certain operative paragraphs contained in draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.2.

On draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.4, 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", India abstained in the voting on the text as a whole. With regard to the sixth preambular paragraph, India's position on the NPT is well known. There is no question of India joining the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.5, entitled "Humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons", India voted in favour of the text, consistent with its participation in the three meetings in Oslo, Nayarit and Vienna on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons. Our participation in those meetings was premised on the shared concerns about the serious threat to the survival of humankind that could be posed by the use of nuclear weapons, in the hope of gaining international support for increased restraints on the use of such weapons.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.47, which we just adopted, is one of the longest-standing resolutions of the First Committee, anchored firmly in the humanitarian tradition of nuclear disarmament. However, for reasons that are difficult to understand, some of the very States

that are in the forefront of the humanitarian discourse and other lead sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.5 have, in the past and today, voted against the resolution on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons this year. We appeal to those States to reconsider their position and narrow the credibility gap between precept and practice, which is difficult to ignore.

On draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.6, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations", India did not participate in the negotiations on the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. Our reasons for not doing so are on record. India therefore cannot be a party to the Treaty and shall not be bound by the obligations that may arise from it. India continues to attach priority to and remains committed to universal non-discriminatory and verifiable nuclear disarmament. In that regard, India supports the commencement of negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear weapons convention in the Conference on Disarmament (CD), which is the world's single multilateral disarmament negotiations forum, working on the basis of consensus.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.17, entitled "Ethical imperatives for a nuclear-weapon-free world", our explanation of vote read out last year on that resolution remains valid. I would just like to state at this point that, while India agrees with several provisions of that resolution, we believe that the global elimination of nuclear weapons will require progressive steps on the reduction of their military utility and role in security policies and a universal commitment to a global and non-discriminatory multilateral framework for nuclear disarmament. Until that stage is accomplished by common agreement, reflected in specific international legal instruments, questions relating to the immorality of nuclear weapons have to be balanced by the sovereign responsibility of States to protect their people in a nuclearized global order, put together on the pillars of nuclear deterrence. India's nuclear doctrine of credible minimum deterrence, with a no-first-use posture, seeks to strike that very balance.

The illegality of nuclear weapons cannot just be a matter of *opinio juris*. It is necessary for the international community to negotiate and conclude specific legal instruments for that purpose. India has therefore proposed a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons to be negotiated in the CD, and has supported a comprehensive nuclear-weapons convention, also to be negotiated in the CD.

We voted against draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.19, entitled “Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments”, as well as its operative paragraph 14, since India, as a non-nuclear-weapon State, cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In urging India to accede to the NPT promptly and without conditions, the draft resolution negates the rules of customary international law as enshrined in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which provides that a State’s acceptance, ratification or accession to a treaty is based on the principle of free consent. India’s position on the NPT is well known; there is no question of India joining the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Nuclear weapons are an integral part of India’s national security and will remain so pending global verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.35, entitled “United action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, we acknowledge that Japan, the lead sponsor, is the only country to have suffered a nuclear-weapons attack. We share the draft resolution’s aspirations on nuclear disarmament, but in substantive terms the text has again fallen short on that subject. India voted against operative paragraph 5, as it cannot accept the call to accede to the NPT. Our position on the NPT is well-known.

India has abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 20, as it supports the commencement in the CD of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty on the basis of CD/1299 and the mandate contained therein. The question of a moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons does not arise. India has also abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 28. As acknowledged by the recently adopted resolution of the International Atomic Energy Agency General Conference on strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards, the concept of a comprehensive safeguards agreement should be seen in its rightful context.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.37, entitled “African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty”, India respects the sovereign choice of non-nuclear-weapon States to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. That principle is consistent with the provisions of the first special

session devoted to disarmament and the 1999 United Nations Disarmament Commission guidelines. India enjoys friendly and mutually beneficial relations with countries of the African continent and recently hosted a summit meeting with all countries of Africa. India shares and supports African aspirations to enhance the region’s well-being and security. We respect the sovereign choice of States parties to the Pelindaba Treaty and welcome its successful entry into force. As a nuclear-weapon State, India conveys its unambiguous assurance that it will respect the status of the African nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Ms. Wood (Australia): I take the floor on behalf of Australia, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia and Spain to explain our votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.5, A/C.1/72/L.17 and A/C.1/72/L.28.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28, Australia has been a long-standing sponsor of the text on a nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas. Other countries joining that statement supported this draft resolution in 2016 and in previous years. We have long supported this text because we value the contributions of nuclear-weapon-free zones to enhancing global and regional peace and security, disarmament and non-proliferation, and, ultimately, to moving us closer to achieving our common goal of a world free of nuclear weapons. Indeed, Australia is a proud member of a southern hemisphere nuclear-weapon-free zone — the Treaty of Rarotonga — which entered into force just over 30 years ago.

This year, draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28 welcomes the adoption of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, which we are unable to support. We made constructive proposals to revise the language in draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28, but those suggestions were not taken on board. As a country located in the southern hemisphere and supportive of nuclear-weapon-free zones, we deeply regret the fact that the lead sponsors did not accept suggestions that countries in the region could support.

Our long-standing consistent opposition to a nuclear-weapon prohibition treaty is well known. We do not believe that the Treaty is an effective way to make sustainable progress on disarmament. It deepens divisions and distracts from our core focus on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Simply declaring that nuclear weapons are unlawful, without the buy-in of possessor States, will not bring us closer to a world without nuclear weapons.

Draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.5 on the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons and A/C.1/72/L.17 on the ethical imperatives for a nuclear-weapon-free world are unbalanced, as they do not take into account the international security environment. The grave humanitarian consequences of a nuclear-weapon detonation are clear and not in dispute. At the same time, security and humanitarian principles coexist. Draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.5 and A/C.1/72/L.17 do not reflect those realities and imperatives. In our 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 remain firmly committed to engaging in such dialogue and to the goal of achieving a nuclear-weapon-free world, but sustainable progress on nuclear disarmament must take account of the security dimension. In summary, there are no shortcuts if our goal is effective, verifiable and irreversible nuclear disarmament, to which our countries are fully committed.

Mr. Davison (Canada): I would like to explain Canada's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.19, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", and A/C.1/72/L.28, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas".

(spoke in French)

Canada is firmly committed to nuclear disarmament. It has been Canada's goal for quite some time. We continue to champion a pragmatic and step-by-step approach to nuclear disarmament, which includes both nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States seeking tangible results. Canada abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.19 in recent years. Since the seventieth session of the General Assembly, we have believed that the changes made to the resolutions have, regrettably, strayed from the essence of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The changes made to the draft resolution undermine the importance given to the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which had been successful in reaching an action plan that we still consider to be a

collective road map to move forward efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, as well as the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

For some time, Canada has had serious reservations about the recently negotiated Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, which does not enjoy the support of the nuclear-weapon States. That said, we share the sentiments that led to the adoption of the Treaty. Progress in the area of nuclear disarmament has been too slow. In support of a pragmatic and collaborative approach to nuclear disarmament, we are leading a United Nations high-level group, supported by an overwhelming majority of countries, that is preparing the way for a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices to help halt the production of nuclear weapons. We believe that a step-by-step approach is the most effective way forward on nuclear disarmament. All States must work together if our goal is effective, verifiable and irreversible nuclear disarmament, to which our countries are fully committed. It is for those reasons that we could not vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.19 and therefore abstained in the voting.

(spoke in English)

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28, Canada welcomes efforts to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones in the southern hemisphere and calls upon the nuclear-weapon States to withdraw any reservations or interpretative declarations contrary to the object and purpose of the treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones. Notwithstanding our overall support for draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28, Canada has serious and long-standing reservations regarding the recently negotiated Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, which does not have the support of the nuclear-weapon States. That being said, we share the sentiment motivating the Treaty. Progress on nuclear disarmament has been too slow. In support of a pragmatic and collaborative approach to nuclear disarmament, we are leading a United Nations high-level group, supported by an overwhelming majority of countries that is preparing the way for a fissile material cut-off treaty to help halt the production of nuclear weapons. We believe that that a step-by-step approach is the most effective way forward on nuclear disarmament. We need all States to work in unison if our goal is the effective, verifiable and irreversible

nuclear disarmament to which our countries are fully committed.

It is for those reasons that, while we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28, we do not support the provisions of the sixth preambular paragraph, which welcomes the adoption of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

Mr. Husem (Norway): I would like to make a statement in explanation of vote.

Norway aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of the Netherlands on behalf of a group of countries on 26 October, ahead of action on cluster 1, “Nuclear disarmament” (see A/C.1/72/PV.23).

Norway is fully committed to the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. To that end, we must foster the confidence needed for balanced, mutual, irreversible and verifiable reductions of nuclear arsenals in the future. That will enable us to achieve and maintain a world without nuclear weapons, regulated by a legal framework. That is a long-term goal, and success will depend on the active participation and cooperation of both nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States. Achieving the total elimination of nuclear weapons will require persistence, realism and patience. It is for that reason that Norway does not believe that the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons will bring us closer to a world without nuclear weapons. Norway therefore voted against any reference to that Treaty in the draft resolutions that have been subject to action by the First Committee.

Norway regrets in particular that it could not support draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.28, the text of which it has supported in previous years. Despite differences on the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, it is our hope that we shall continue to seek common ground in moving nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation forward. A good start would be to ensure a successful outcome of the current review cycle of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Norway remains firmly committed to the NPT and the outcome documents from past Review Conferences.

Norway looks forward to working with other States Members of the United Nations in further developing measures that will enable us to reach global zero. In that regard, nuclear-disarmament verification is important in laying the groundwork for the total elimination of nuclear arms.

Mrs. Schneider Calza (Brazil): I take the floor to explain my delegation’s positions on draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.10/Rev.1, A/C.1/72/L.42 and A/C.1/72/L.47.

The Brazilian delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.47, entitled “Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons”. In previous years, my delegation supported that text because we shared the understanding that nuclear weapons constitute a threat to the survival of humankind and should therefore never again be used. We stress the need to go beyond the mere prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons to their complete elimination, as their very existence is a threat to international peace and security.

However, the adoption on 7 July of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons has eliminated the need for negotiations on an instrument that prohibits the use of nuclear weapons, as the Treaty has a comprehensive set of prohibitions on such weapons. While we appreciate the efforts made by the main sponsor of the resolution to include a reference to the Treaty, we are no longer in a position to support it because negotiating a less ambitious instrument would unnecessarily duplicate efforts and detract from what should be our focus — bringing the Treaty into force and moving towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons, within its framework.

For the same reasons, we also abstained in the voting on A/C.1/72/L.10/Rev.1, entitled “Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons”. Although we have sponsored the analogous resolution in previous years, the adoption of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons also makes redundant a specific instrument on negative security assurances. The total elimination of nuclear weapons is a tall order, and we should focus our efforts on bringing the Treaty into force and on negotiating instruments that will move us forward.

Brazil voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.42, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty” (CTBT), in the light of our continuing support of the CTBT’s integrity and entry into force, as an important nuclear-disarmament and non-proliferation measure. We regret, however, the continued reference made in the draft resolution to Security Council resolution 2310 (2016), which is counterproductive to the Treaty’s entry into force

and unduly encroaches on the responsibilities of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization. For that reason, we abstained in the voting on the fourth preambular paragraph. We hope to see that issue resolved in future iterations of the draft resolution, in accordance with the widespread commitment to enhance and renew efforts for the entry into force of the CTBT and to its consolidation as a stepping stone for a world free of nuclear weapons.

The Chair: I now call on those delegations wishing to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I remind all delegations that the first intervention is limited to 10 minutes and the second intervention to five minutes.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): I am exercising my right of reply to respond to some remarks that were made yesterday by the representatives of a few countries. I will be relatively brief.

First, I would like to respond to remarks made by the representative of North Korea (see A/C.1/72/PV.22). He stated that the problems on the Korean peninsula arise from issues between North Korea and the United States. I would like to point out that taking what has been said in the First Committee, the Security Council and the Conference on Disarmament into account, it is clearly an issue between North Korea and the rest of the international community.

Secondly, I would like to respond to comments made yesterday by the representative of the Russian Federation (see A/C.1/72/PV.23). His comments that the United States tried to overturn victory in Europe were utter nonsense. A couple of days ago, I addressed a whole range of NATO issues. He emphasized that it was important not to forget history. I absolutely agree with that statement, but I believe that it is equally important that we not distort history.

Lastly, I would like to respond to comments made by the representative of Iran (see A/C.1/72/PV.23), who referred to the outcome of the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The language of the 2015 outcome of the NPT Review Conference, relating to a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, was not based on the consensus of all parties of the region. It was biased and, frankly, would have tried to impose a particular outcome on one State of the region. Given the imbalance and

biased language in the text, there was no way the United States could support the final outcome document.

Mr. Ri Im Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I would like to respond to the ridiculous remarks made by the representative of the United States regime. I have already made it clear on several occasions at previous meetings that the issue on the Korean peninsula is the direct result of the threats and hostile policy of the United States. I would like to make it clear that if the United States regime wants peace in the world and on the Korean peninsula, it simply needs to dismantle its nuclear weapons and sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear-weapon State. All issues will then be resolved.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We must respond to the remarks made by the representative of Ukraine. She alleged that Russia is violating the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This is not a serious allegation. We understand the difficulties faced by Ukraine in the aftermath of a brutal and bloody coup d'état, supported by the United States and the European Union. We all understand those difficulties, but to make comments that are clearly nonsense and risk being shamed at the United Nations is unacceptable. On behalf of everyone perhaps, I hope that we will soon see a Ukrainian delegation that behaves in a serious and responsible manner and truly represents the views of its brotherly people.

Mr. Al Habib (Islamic Republic of Iran): I agree with the representative of the United States when he states that we should not distort history. That also applies to the business of the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The draft outcome document of the 2015 NPT Review Conference was acceptable to all States parties to the NPT in the Middle East. Now, two years later, stating that it was not acceptable to the countries of the Middle East is a clear distortion of history and therefore unacceptable. We know that Israel was the only country that rejected that outcome document, and, as it is not party to the NPT, that rejection was done through the United States. Those are the realities of which everyone in the Committee is well aware. It is a fact that cannot be denied.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): I apologize for taking the floor again, but I would like to respond to the comments made by the representative of Pyongyang.

Let us be clear — and my remarks are directed at the representative of that regime — it is his State that is the outlaw State. It is his State that has violated countless Security Council resolutions. It is his State that is singled out for criticism in the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Conference on Disarmament. It is his State that is called out time and again. His State needs to disarm and do so now. His State is the greatest threat to peace on the Korean peninsula and beyond. He should not therefore try to change the narrative. It is his country that is of great concern to the world and a threat to peace. It is therefore time for his regime to disarm.

To respond to the representative of Iran, the United States has been a major supporter of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, but a successful conference will not be held on that issue unless and until there is a willingness on the part of all States of the region to engage with all other States of the region. Until that time, it is hard to imagine establishing a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. For it to be established, there must be direct regional dialogue. Without it, I fail to see how the zone could be established.

Ms. Bila (Ukraine): We are all a bit tired of the rhetoric of the Russian Federation's representatives. They never even change their text. I would like to recall the words of the representative of South Korea, who said that if the sky is blue, the sky is blue — no one can change that. I can say the same thing about the Russian Federation. Russia invaded my country and started a war. The representatives of Russia can repeat their nonsense a million times but it does not change

the truth, and everyone in the First Committee clearly understands that.

Mr. Ri Im Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I would like to respond to the provocative allegations made by the representative of the United States, which we completely reject. I would just like to underscore that the United States was the first country to produce a nuclear weapon and the only one to use a nuclear weapon, which killed hundreds of thousands of innocent people. The United States is now attempting to commit that same crime on the Korean peninsula. Our policy is to deter the nuclear threat from the United States regime. I would like to point out that all threats to the Korean peninsula are posed by the United States. Once again, the United States should dismantle all its nuclear weapons and sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear-weapon State.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I apologize for taking the floor once more to address this sensitive issue. Regrettably, it keeps cropping up. It is a painful subject for us. The events occurring in Ukraine are an open wound for Russia. We are sure that, over time, everyone — all Europeans and the entire world — will gain an understanding about what is occurring in Ukraine, and that eventually the situation in Ukraine will be stabilized. When that happens, we hope we will no longer hear those who sit behind Ukraine's country plate in the First Committee stating that Russia is violating the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or waging war on Ukraine.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.