



General Assembly

Sixty-seventh session

First Committee

19th meeting

Monday, 5 November 2012, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Percaya (Indonesia)

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

Agenda items 86 to 102 (continued)

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

The Chair: I hope that members all had a very good weekend. We are going to have quite a long day today, morning and afternoon, to take action on a number of draft resolutions and decisions.

This morning, the Committee will continue to take action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under agenda items 86 to 102. As members will recall, we finished taking action on the draft resolutions and decisions contained in informal paper 1 last Friday. Today, the Committee will take up the draft resolutions and decisions listed in informal paper 2, which the Secretariat has now circulated among delegations. We will first consider the drafts listed under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons". Thereafter, the Committee will turn to the other clusters contained in informal paper 2.

Our deliberations today and for the rest of the action phase of our work will be guided by the same procedure we observed last Friday, which has traditionally guided this segment of the Committee's work over the years. Delegations will first have an opportunity to make general statements under each cluster and to explain their positions before and after action is taken on each draft resolution or decision.

In that connection, I wish to remind all delegations that, in accordance with the rules of procedure, the sponsors of draft resolutions may make general statements at the beginning of the consideration of the draft resolutions and decisions under the cluster relating to their drafts, but may not make statements in explanation of their positions or votes before or after action is taken.

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

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): There are three draft resolutions that the Committee will not take up today, including draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.40, which will be the subject of certain oral revisions. As we agreed at the previous meeting, the Secretariat created a separate page on QuickFirst entitled "Drafts with oral revisions". We have uploaded there all the texts we received from delegations, with the oral revisions in "track changes". There are several draft resolutions there. I encourage delegations that do not see their oral revisions listed to please send them to us as soon as possible so that they may be reflected on that page.

Under cluster 3, draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.22 will also not be taken up today, as it is connected with draft decision A/C.1/67/L.11, in connection with which we are awaiting the document on budgetary implications. Action will be taken at a later stage.

Finally, we will not take up draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.59 today, the last draft listed in informal

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the 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-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

12-57297 (E)



Please recycle

paper 2, because we are still awaiting the document on the programme budget implications, .

The Chair: Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions and decision under cluster 1, entitled “Nuclear weapons”, we will hear from delegations that wish to explain their positions on those drafts, or to introduce draft resolutions. Given the time constraints facing the Committee, I again appeal to all delegations to kindly consider taking the floor for that purpose in the General Assembly instead of here. That is only an appeal from the Chair, and I do understand the importance of taking the floor at the time we take action.

I now give the floor to the representative of Canada to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41.

Mr. Rishchynski (Canada): Canada is pleased to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41 to the First Committee. In the interests of time, I will deliver a shortened version of my introduction, but would ask that the full statement on disarmament machinery be posted on the QuickFirst website and included in the verbatim records of this meeting.

The current text is the result of very fruitful consultations. Canada has greatly appreciated the strong interest of delegations and their substantive suggestions on the text, which demonstrates the positive commitment that exists with regard to advancing work towards the eventual negotiation of a treaty. This draft resolution offers a modest but pragmatic approach to address the call by this body in resolution 66/44 to consider options to advance negotiations on a treaty. It requests the Secretary-General to seek the views of all Member States in 2013 on a treaty and to establish a 25-person group of governmental experts that would make recommendations on possible aspects that could contribute to a treaty. Such a group would enable a focused and substantive discussion among experts that could meaningfully take forward the possible substance of the issue. Such a group could make a substantive contribution to advancing action 15 of the 2010 action plan on the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It would also be consistent with past calls for work in that regard, including with respect to the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Considerable efforts have been made with regard to the draft resolution in order to respect the role of the Conference on Disarmament as the world’s single

multilateral negotiating forum. The draft resolution recognizes that, if possible, negotiations should take place in the Conference and that the group of governmental experts is intended to provide a venue for substantive progress on the issue only in the context of the current deadlock.

We therefore ask that Member States vote in favour of this draft resolution.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Mongolia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.40.

Ms. Battungalag (Mongolia): On behalf of the sponsors, I take the floor formally to introduce to the First Committee revised draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.40, entitled “Mongolia’s international security and nuclear-weapon-free status”.

In that connection, paragraph 3 should read as follows:

“Welcomes the declarations of 17 September 2012 by Mongolia and the five nuclear-weapon States on Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free status as a concrete contribution to nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the enhancement of confidence and predictability in the region.”

We believe that draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.40, as orally revised, will receive the full support of all delegations and that, as in previous years, the Committee will adopt it without a vote.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Australia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.43.

Mr. Wilson (Australia): I have the pleasure to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.43, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”, on behalf of Australia, Mexico, New Zealand and some 98 other sponsors.

The draft resolution once again stresses the vital importance and urgency of signing and ratifying the Treaty and urges all States not to carry out nuclear-weapon-test explosions or any other nuclear explosions. We again hope that this draft resolution will enjoy strong support this year.

Mr. Propper (Israel): I take the floor with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”. Following your request, Mr. Chair, I will shorten my statement.

Every year we question the motivation of the authors behind the draft resolution entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East” and the motivation of the States that vote in favour of it. We cannot help but wonder if the distance between New York and the Middle East has not been stretched unnaturally to such an extent that vision has been irreparably blurred. There is no question regarding the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. With four out of five widely acknowledged cases of gross non-compliance with obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons taking place in the Middle East, while the fifth case, namely, that of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, is heavily involved in nuclear proliferation to the Middle East, this seems to require no great cognitive powers.

All of those cases fundamentally challenge Israel’s security and cast a dark shadow on the prospect of embarking on a meaningful regional security process. Israel expects that, under the title of “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”, the international community would look closely at the cases of Iran and Syria.

In the light of what I have just said, we call upon representatives not to play into the hands of those who wish to divert attention from the real problem of the Middle East, and to vote against this draft resolution. I will cut my statement short here, and I ask that my full statement be reflected in the official records.

Ms. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Following your suggestion last week, Mr. Chair, our delegation sent its statements on the thematic debate to be published on the website. I ask that that be taken into account in the records of this meeting. However, having taken into account the fact that the adoption of the draft resolutions is a very important part of the work of the Committee, with the Chair’s permission, we would like, as is customary, to make a number of general statements on the different clusters. I shall endeavour to shorten my statement on cluster 1, entitled “Nuclear weapons”, as follows.

Cuba sponsors various draft resolutions that are included in cluster 1, on which we are going to take action today. Those drafts resolutions are contained in document A/C.1/67/L.52, entitled “Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons”; A/C.1/67/L.27, entitled

“Reducing nuclear danger”; and A/C.1/67/L.25, entitled “Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons”.

We reiterate that the security guarantees that we have received up until now have not been effective. So long as the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons has not been reached, we should have a legally binding international mechanism through which nuclear-weapon States provide guarantees to non-nuclear States against the use or threat of use of such weapons.

Cuba has repeatedly stated at the highest level the need to completely eliminate nuclear weapons. We support the convening of an international high-level conference to achieve an agreement on a programme for the full elimination of nuclear weapons.

Cuba reiterates the importance of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in different regions of the world, with a significant contribution to that process from Member States and as an important step towards achieving nuclear disarmament. For that reason, my delegation will support the draft resolutions that have been introduced on this topic.

We reiterate our strong support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. The establishment of such a zone in that region would be an important contribution to the achievement of nuclear disarmament and a very meaningful step in the peace process in the region. To achieve that, it is necessary that Israel join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and submit its nuclear installations to the comprehensive safeguards regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency. In that respect, Cuba hopes that a successful conference on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East will be convened in 2012, with the participation of all States of the region.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to speakers who wish to take the floor to make statements in explanation of vote or position before we begin to take action on the drafts before the Committee.

Ms. Apeyitou (Cyprus): I speak on behalf of the member States of the European Union (EU) on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”.

We intend to vote in favour of this draft resolution. The EU has always been fully committed to the

establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction, whether nuclear, chemical or biological, and their delivery systems. The EU welcomed the reaffirmation by the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) of the 1995 NPT resolution on the Middle East and the endorsement of practical steps leading to the full implementation of that resolution.

We welcomed the appointment of Under-Secretary of State Jaakko Laajava, of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, as facilitator and the designation of Finland as the host Government for the 2012 conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. We also welcomed the report of facilitator Laajava presented during the first session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference.

As announced at this year's Preparatory Committee session, the EU is pleased to confirm that an academic seminar will be held in Brussels on 5 and 6 November that will allow for an open exchange of views on all aspects related to the establishment of a zone free from weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

Furthermore, we call on all States in the region that have not yet done so to accede to the NPT and the conventions for the prohibition of chemical and biological weapons, to sign and ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, and to conclude comprehensive safeguards agreements and additional protocols with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

We regret that this draft resolution is not sufficiently comprehensive in that it does not address in a resolute way all the nuclear proliferation challenges in the region. In that regard, Iran's nuclear and missile programmes, which violate six Security Council and 12 IAEA Board of Governors resolutions, and Syria's non-compliance with its Safeguards Agreement and continued non-cooperation with the Agency are of particular concern.

The IAEA Board of Governors expressed its grave concerns over Iran's nuclear programme through the adoption of a new resolution on 13 September. It urged Iran to comply fully and without delay with all its obligations under the relevant Security Council resolutions and to meet the requirements of the IAEA Board of Governors, thereby deciding that Iran's cooperation on all outstanding issues, including those

related to possible military dimensions, was essential and urgent in order to restore international confidence in the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear programme.

The Council of Foreign Affairs of the EU, on 15 October, and the European Council, on 19 October, also reiterated their serious and deepening concerns over Iran's nuclear programme. The Foreign Affairs Council condemned the continued production of enriched uranium and the expansion of Iran's enrichment capacity, including at the Fordow site, as well as its continued heavy-water-related activities in breach of Security Council and Board of Governors resolutions, as reflected in the most recent IAEA report. The Council also noted with particular concern Iran's obstruction of the IAEA work towards the clarification of all outstanding issues, including with respect to the possible military dimension to Iran's nuclear programme.

The EU's objective remains to achieve a comprehensive, negotiated long-term settlement. The E3+3 — China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States, led by the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign and Security Policy — remain firm, clear and united in seeking a swift diplomatic resolution of the international community's concerns on the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear programme, based on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the full implementation of Security Council and IAEA Board of Governors resolutions.

Clear and credible proposals were laid out in recent months for an initial confidence-building step that would address the immediate key concerns, focusing on Iran's 20 per cent enrichment activities in a comprehensive manner, as well as reciprocal steps that would benefit Iran. We urge Iran once again to engage seriously and to urgently take the necessary steps that will allow for the restoration of confidence.

Syria's non-compliance with its Safeguards Agreement and its continued non-cooperation with the IAEA remain to be addressed by the Security Council. Even in the present situation, the Syrian authorities remain responsible for urgently remedying their non-compliance with their Safeguards Agreement, for cooperating urgently and transparently with the Agency to clarify matters with regard to Deir Al-Zour and other sites, and for bringing into force an additional protocol as soon as possible.

Mr. Kang Myong Chol (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): In explanation of position or vote on the draft resolutions listed under the cluster entitled "Nuclear weapons", on which action will be taken today, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will, in accordance with the ground rules, make a consolidated statement on an item-by-item basis.

First, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", which was introduced under agenda item 97, my delegation intends to vote in favour, because the Democratic People's Republic of Korea remains consistent and firm in its position of full support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. In particular, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea urges Israel, the only country in the region possessing nuclear weapons, to renounce the possession of such weapons and mend relations with its neighbours as a step towards enhancing regional peace and security. Although my delegation supports the primary focus of the draft resolution, we are uncomfortable with some elements in the text, such as the call for adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and acceptance of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea's position on the withdrawal from the NPT and the IAEA is well known. My delegation therefore disassociates itself from the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.13, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", introduced under agenda item 93, my delegation intends to vote against the draft resolution, because paragraph 12 fails to achieve fairness and balance by describing the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula as dependent upon a unilateral undertaking by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to abandon its nuclear weapons. My delegation would like to recall the Joint Statement of the Six Parties adopted in 2005, under which each party has an equal share of obligations to be fulfilled in order to achieve the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula, and all parties agreed to take coordinated steps, in line with the principle of action-for-action. The Joint Statement placed particular emphasis on the commitments of all parties to "respect each other's sovereignty, exist peacefully together and take steps to normalize their relations". The United States, however, refuses to

recognize the sovereignty of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and continues to pursue a hostile policy, with the goal of overthrowing the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's political system. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea opted for the possession of nuclear weapons not because it had any nuclear ambition, but because it had to safeguard its sovereignty and deter a nuclear attack by the United States. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea's nuclear deterrent is a reliable guarantee that prevents war and ensures peace and stability on the Korean peninsula.

However, my delegation's negative vote on that draft resolution should not be construed as sidetracking from its commitment and readiness to work with others to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea aligns itself with the principled position of the Non-Aligned Movement on nuclear disarmament, which remains the fundamental issue and the highest priority. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is ready to join the international nuclear disarmament efforts on an equal footing with other nuclear-weapon States. It will neither compete in a nuclear arms race nor overproduce nuclear weapons beyond its need for self-defence. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea will continue to make consistent efforts to denuclearize the world, including the Korean peninsula, regardless of whether the Six-Party Talks resume or not.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.49, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", introduced under sub-item (z) of agenda item 94, and draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.43, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", introduced under agenda item 100, my delegation will also vote against those draft resolutions, because the sixteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.49 and paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.43 contain references to the implementation of Security Council resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009), which followed the two nuclear tests of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Those nuclear tests were self-defensive measures taken by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as it confronted the increasing nuclear threat of the United States. The Security Council, however, acted irresponsibly and unfairly, blaming the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for nuclear tests, while turning a blind eye to the nuclear threats of the United States, which gave rise to the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula. As

far as the testing of nuclear weapons is concerned, the five permanent members of the Security Council have conducted 99 per cent of all nuclear tests to date, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea only two — namely, the two-thousand-fifty-third and -fourth tests. In the light of such facts, those two Security Council resolutions are the product of high-handed arbitrariness and double standards.

Moreover, draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.49 expresses concern regarding the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's uranium enrichment, the light water reactor construction and the launch of a space satellite, which are all for peaceful purposes. The peaceful uses of nuclear energy and free access to outer space are inalienable rights of all sovereign States. Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.49 also states that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea cannot have the status of a nuclear-weapon State under the NPT. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not feel any need to be publicly recognized as a nuclear-weapon State. It is simply satisfied that it is capable of defending its sovereignty and security with its own nuclear weapons. Now that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has become a full-fledged nuclear-weapon State, it is unthinkable that it return to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State.

As far as adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) is concerned, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea considers the matter very carefully, taking into account the unique security circumstances on the Korean peninsula. The core objective of the CTBT is non-proliferation. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has rather a different opinion, that is, that nuclear disarmament should receive the highest priority, since nuclear proliferation itself stems from the threat of use of nuclear weapons by nuclear-weapon States.

Last but not least, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", introduced under sub-item (y) of agenda item 94, my delegation intends to abstain in the voting. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to reiterate its position that the Conference on Disarmament is the only appropriate forum for the negotiation and adoption of a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT). Any attempt to take the FMCT negotiations outside the Conference on Disarmament would undermine the authority and

confidence of the Conference. If it is difficult to reach an agreement on an issue, further issues should be made for compromise and consensus, which is the established rule for decision-making. The main cause of the stalled negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament is not the technical failure of working procedures but the lack of political will of some countries to deal equally with all core issues.

Mr. Eloumni (Morocco): Morocco supports the negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) and remains convinced that the Conference on Disarmament is the appropriate forum for negotiating such a treaty. We will cast a positive vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41, taking into consideration the constructive approach adopted by the authors in addressing our concerns and dealing with our proposals. We decided to support the draft resolution with the understanding that a group of governmental experts was not the most appropriate format for an inclusive process and that it will have the sole aim of facilitating any future work of the Conference on Disarmament on an FMCT, which should take into account all legitimate national security concerns. To that end, the Conference on Disarmament should agree and implement as soon as possible a comprehensive and balanced programme of work that also includes negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

Morocco remains open to all discussions and deliberations on advancing the objective of nuclear disarmament in full respect of the integrity and respective mandates and competence of the entities of the United Nations disarmament machinery.

Ms. Crittenberger (United States of America): My delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". The United States believes that, again this year, this draft resolution fails to meet the fundamental test of fairness and balance. It confines itself to expressions of concern about the activities of a single country, while omitting any reference to serious nuclear proliferation concerns in the region.

The most glaring omission continues to be the lack of any reference to Iran's violations of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) obligations and relevant Security Council resolutions, and its failure to cooperate fully and transparently with the IAEA.

Notwithstanding our vote against the draft resolution, I would like to reiterate the long-standing position of the United States in support of universal adherence to the NPT and to the noble goal of a Middle East free of all weapons of mass destruction. That is an achievable goal, provided that peace and security in the region and full compliance by States with their non-proliferation undertakings can be assured.

I would also like to highlight our readiness to work with others to build the confidence necessary to ensure the success of a regional conference to discuss a Middle East zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. That will require that the States concerned engage directly to create the conditions necessary to hold a conference that is conducted in a constructive and unbiased way. Unfortunately, the pursuit of this unbalanced draft resolution, year after year, undercuts prospects for such an outcome. We find that regrettable and call on the sponsors to take a more constructive approach in United Nations forums such as the First Committee.

Mr. Langeland (Norway): Norway will vote for draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.2, but Norway also shares the concern raised by the observer of the European Union in her explanation of vote.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”, was introduced under agenda item 97 by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the League of Arab States at the Committee’s 9th meeting, on 16 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/67/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.1/67/L.2. We will first take action on the fifth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain,

Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, 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 Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Pakistan

The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 159 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, 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 Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Pakistan

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 159 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/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, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, 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, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Ethiopia, India, Panama

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.2, as a whole, was adopted by 158 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Côte d'Ivoire informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.4/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia". I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.4/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia", was introduced by the representative of Kazakhstan at the Committee's 9th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.4/Rev.1 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.3.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan,

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.4/Rev.1 was adopted by 131 votes to 4, with 34 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Bulgaria informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Chair: We shall now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/67/L.7, entitled "Missiles". I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/67/L.7, entitled "Missiles", was submitted by the representative of Iran, including on behalf of other sponsors. The sponsors of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/67/L.7.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/67/L.7 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.13, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.13, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", was introduced by the representative of Sweden, under sub-item (x) of agenda item, at the Committee's 9th

meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.13 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.3.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 11.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, 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, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, Germany, Guinea, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 11 was retained by 154 votes to 4, with 7 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Guinea informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.13 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan,

Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.13, as a whole, was adopted by 156 votes to 7, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.25, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.25, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", was introduced by the representative of India, under sub-item (g) of agenda item 95, at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 19 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.25 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.3.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, 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, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua,

Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Marshall Islands, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Serbia, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.25 was adopted by 110 votes to 47, with 10 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Ukraine informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.]

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.27.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.27, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger", was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 19 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.27 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.3.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, 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, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Belarus, China, Georgia, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Marshall Islands, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Serbia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.27 was adopted by 108 votes to 48, with 13 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.28.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.28, entitled "Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems", was introduced by the representative of Switzerland at the Committee's 9th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.28 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.3.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.28.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan,

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Hungary, India, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Turkey, Ukraine,

The eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.28 was retained by 146 votes to 4, with 15 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Georgia and the Republic of Moldova informed the Secretariat that they had intended to abstain.]

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.28 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia,

Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, 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:

Andorra, Croatia, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.28, as a whole, was adopted by 145 votes to 4, with 19 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.39, entitled "Preventing the acquisition by terrorists of radioactive sources". I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.39, entitled "Preventing the acquisition by terrorists of radioactive sources", was submitted by the representative of France. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.39 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.3.

I would also like to draw the attention of the Chair to some editorial corrections to the text. The reference to "emission devices" in the fourth preambular paragraph should read "emitting devices" instead. Also, in the twentieth preambular paragraph, the text should read "this rising concern", not "the rising concern".

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.39, as orally corrected, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41, entitled "Treaty

banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices". I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", was introduced by the representative of Canada at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 1 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/67/L.41.

On 1 November, the delegation of Canada also circulated the following revisions. The reference in paragraph 2 to "elements therein" should read "aspects thereof". The reference in paragraph 3 to "possible elements that could contribute to a treaty" should read "possible aspects that could contribute to but not negotiate a treaty". Finally, today that delegation indicated that the reference in paragraph 9 to "and other nuclear explosive devices" in the penultimate line should read "or other nuclear explosive devices".

With the permission of the Chair, I will now read for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41, the General Assembly would request

"the Secretary-General to establish a group of governmental experts with a membership of 25 States, chosen on the basis of equitable geographical representation, which, taking into account the report containing the views of Member States, will make recommendations on possible elements that could contribute to a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, on the basis of document CD/1299 and the mandate contained therein, and which will operate on the basis of consensus, without prejudice to national positions in future negotiations, meeting in Geneva for two sessions of two weeks each in 2014 and 2015".

It is recalled that resources for the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs in Geneva are included under section 4, "Disarmament", and that the resources for conference servicing are included under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management", of the programme budget for the period 2012-2013. In that

regard, the implementation of the request contained in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution will not give rise to additional requirements under the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

However, it is anticipated that the request contained in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41 will necessitate additional requirements under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015. Such additional requirements will fall under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management", and section 4, "Disarmament". Should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, the conference servicing requirements for the two sessions of two weeks' duration each in 2014 and 2015 for the group of governmental experts are estimated as \$573,300, based on current rates. In addition, the non-conference servicing requirements are estimated at \$450,000, which includes the travel of experts and the cost of a consultant. Those requirements will be considered under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management", and section 4, "Disarmament", in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

The Chair: A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States

of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, 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, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia

Against:

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 3, as orally revised, was retained by 143 votes to 3, with 22 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan,

Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia

Against:

Pakistan

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41, as a whole and as orally revised, was adopted by 148 votes to 1, with 20 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.43, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty". I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.43, was introduced under agenda item 100, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", by the representative of Australia at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 19 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/67/L.43 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.3.

The Chair: A separate recorded vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.43.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, 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 Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

India, Israel, Mauritius, Pakistan

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 163 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.43 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, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

India, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.43, as a whole, was adopted by 166 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.49, entitled “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.49 was introduced under sub-item (z) of agenda item 94, entitled “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, by the representative of Japan at the Committee’s 9th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.49 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.3.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested on the draft resolution as a whole. Separate, recorded votes have also been requested on paragraphs 2, 8, 9 and 16. We shall first take action on operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal,

Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Mauritius, Pakistan

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 165 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 8.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, 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, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania,

Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic

Operative paragraph 8 was retained by 165 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 9.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

China, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mauritius, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Operative paragraph 9 was retained by 162 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 16.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall

Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

Argentina, Brazil, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mauritius, Pakistan, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 16 was retained by 161 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.49 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, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia,

Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mauritius, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.49, as a whole, was adopted by 159 votes to 1, with 12 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.52. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.52 was submitted by the representative of Pakistan under agenda item 91, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/67/L.52 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.3.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh,

Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe,

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, 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.1/67/L.52 was adopted by 113 votes to 0, with 57 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.55, entitled "African

Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty". I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.55 was introduced by the representative of Nigeria under agenda item 87, "entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty", on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States and other States at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 2 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/67/L.55 and A/C.1/67/CRP.3/Rev.3.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.55 was adopted.

The Chair: I shall now call upon delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. Li Yang (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to take this opportunity to express its position in the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/67/L.13, A/C.1/67/L.41 and A/C.1/67/L.49.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.13, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world", China has always upheld the goal of the general and complete destruction of nuclear weapons and their prohibition. We endorse the objective and purpose of the draft resolution. However, some of its content goes beyond the provisions of the outcome document of the 2010 Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol.I)). China therefore abstained in the voting. China remains of the view that different parties should gradually implement specific measures for nuclear disarmament in accordance with the 2010 eighth NPT Review Conference outcome document.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", China abstained in the voting on some of the paragraphs and on the draft resolution as a whole. Our main reservation is that the draft resolution does not specify that the Conference on Disarmament is the only viable venue for negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT). It cannot guarantee that a relevant group of governmental experts will finally be re-established in the Conference on Disarmament. Furthermore, to take this issue of central importance

away from the Conference on Disarmament will not help to consolidate and defend its status. China has always maintained that, with a view to reaching a balanced plan, the Conference on Disarmament should start negotiations on an FMCT as soon as possible. Only in so doing can all major countries participate in the negotiations so as to achieve the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.49, entitled “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, China cannot support paragraph 9, on the announcement of a moratorium on the reduction of fissile materials. That will not help to promote the timely launching of negotiations on an FMCT. We therefore voted against that paragraph and abstained on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Wilson (Australia): I take the floor to explain my delegation’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.2. Australia is committed to preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and to the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons. As an active State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), we will continue to promote those objectives in all relevant international forums.

Our strong advocacy for the universalization of the NPT and for the universal application of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, including the additional protocol, is a matter of record. Australia has long been a supporter of effectively verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zones freely arrived at by Member States, and we have consistently supported the General Assembly resolution calling for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Australia places greatest importance on the implementation of the consensus outcome document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol.I)) and supports the practical steps endorsed by that Conference towards the convening of a conference in 2012 on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems.

Australia’s view has been consistent for a long time: all States should adhere to the NPT and their nuclear facilities should therefore be subject to IAEA inspection. We reiterate our call for all States to join the NPT and place their nuclear facilities under comprehensive IAEA safeguards.

Australia supports much of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.2. However, a draft resolution entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East” that refers only to Israel and makes no reference to the current worsening nuclear proliferation risks in the Middle East and the challenges they pose is, in our view, unbalanced. That is particularly so when Iran is subject to sanctions under the Security Council resolutions that address its deeply troubling nuclear activities and when Syria also refuses to address international concerns about the nature of its nuclear another weapons of mass destruction-related activities. We therefore had once again to abstain in the voting on that draft resolution.

Mr. Bavaud (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I take the floor to deliver an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”.

Once again this year, Switzerland voted in favour this draft resolution, which promotes the universalization of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in the Middle East region. Switzerland fully supports that goal. We welcome the practical measures adopted at the 2010 NPT Review Conference with respect to establishing a zone in the Middle East free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, in particular the holding of a conference on that subject in 2012. We support the efforts made to that end by the facilitator, the Under-Secretary of State of Finland, Mr. Jaako Laajava.

With regard to the content of the draft resolution, Switzerland notes that in its operative paragraphs reference is made to only one of the dimensions linked to the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. By voting for the draft resolution, Switzerland intends to demonstrate the importance of the full implementation of the obligations stemming from the NPT on all States in the region. In that context, the full cooperation of those States with the relevant organizations working to combat nuclear proliferation, especially the International Atomic Energy Agency, is essential. In order to implement the draft resolution in question and fulfil the objective of preventing the risk of nuclear proliferation in as broad manner as possible, it is indispensable for States to bear in mind the current context and all developments affecting all countries in the region.

Mr. Gill (India): I take the floor to explain India's vote on some of the draft resolutions adopted under this cluster.

On draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", India abstained on the draft resolution as a whole and voted against the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs, as we believe that the focus of the draft resolution should be limited to the region that it intends to address. India's position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is well known. The 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which codified the prevailing customary international law, provides that States are bound by a treaty based on the principle of free consent. The call to those States remaining outside the NPT to accede to it and to accept International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards on all their nuclear activities is at variance with that principle and does not reflect current realities.

On draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.13, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", India remains committed to the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. We are concerned about the threat to humankind posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use or threat of use. India also shares the view that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing. We continue to support a time-bound programme for global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament. We voted against the draft resolution, since India cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear-weapon State. In urging India to accede to 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.

On draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.28, entitled "Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems", India has for some time sponsored a draft resolution entitled "Reducing nuclear danger" (A/C.1/67/L.27), which the Committee again adopted

this year by a large majority. That has been the case for a decade now. When the draft resolution on decreasing operational readiness was introduced for the first time, in 2007, and again in 2008 and 2010, India extended its support, given the common objectives and congruence in the content of the two draft resolutions. Unlike some of the sponsors of the draft resolution, India's approach is to assess draft resolutions by an objective standard and on their merits. Despite the no vote exercised by some of the sponsors on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.27, India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.28, in view of the importance we attach to de-alerting as an important step in the process of de-legitimizing nuclear weapons. However, we abstained in the voting on the eighth preambular of the draft resolution. India's position on the NPT is well known. India is not a party to the Treaty and did not participate in the 2010 NPT Review Conference. We are therefore not bound by its outcome. Furthermore, the issue that the draft resolution seeks to address is not limited to the context of a specific treaty, which is a point that some of the sponsors have themselves made to us with regard to our draft resolution.

On draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.40, as a country that maintains the friendliest of fraternal ties with Mongolia, India welcomes the adoption, without a vote, of the draft resolution on Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status. We note the many steps that Mongolia has taken to reinforce such a status and that Mongolia has received support and security assurances for such a status from Member States, particularly those that possess nuclear weapons. India fully respects the choice made by Mongolia and conveys its unambiguous assurance that it will respect Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status.

On draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", it has been India's consistent position that, without prejudice to the priority we attach to nuclear disarmament, we support the negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament of a non-discriminatory and internationally verifiable treaty banning the future production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices. The establishment of a group of governmental experts under this draft resolution should not replace the Conference on Disarmament as the forum for the negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT). In our view, therefore, the work of the proposed group of governmental experts amounts to neither

pre-negotiations nor negotiations on an FMCT, which should take place in the Conference on Disarmament on the basis of the agreed mandate. Furthermore, it is our understanding that the report of the Secretary-General referred to in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, as is the established practice, will contain only the views of Member States received by the Secretariat. India supports the Conference on Disarmament as the world's single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, and we hope that its member States will redouble efforts to enable the Conference to commence substantive work at an early date.

On draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.49, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", India remains committed to the goal of global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament in a time-bound framework. We have stressed the need for a step-by-step process underwritten by a universal commitment and an agreed multilateral framework for achieving global and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament. In substantive terms, the draft resolution falls short of that objective. India voted against paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, as we cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear-weapon State. India's position on the NPT is well known. There is no question of India joining the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Nuclear weapons are an integral part of India's national security and will remain so, pending non-discriminatory and global nuclear disarmament. Consistent with its position on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, India abstained in the voting on paragraph 8. As India supports the commencement of negotiations on an FMCT in the Conference on Disarmament, the question of a moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons does not arise. We therefore also abstained on paragraph 9. India also abstained on paragraph 16. The concept of a comprehensive safeguards agreement is applicable only to States that have undertaken legal obligations to accept such safeguards, and therefore cannot apply to all States.

Finally, on draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.55, 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 Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2) and the 1999 Disarmament Commission guidelines. India

enjoys friendly and mutually beneficial relations with countries of the African continent. India shares and supports African aspirations for enhancing its regions' well-being and security. We respect the sovereign choice of States parties to the Pelindaba Treaty and welcome the successful entry into force thereof. As a nuclear-weapon State, India conveys its unambiguous assurance that it will respect the status of the African nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The delegation of the Russian Federation would like to touch upon the details and the reasons for its votes on four draft resolutions that we have considered, namely, A/C.1/67/L.2, A/C.1/67/L.13, A/C.1/67/L.28 and A/C.1/67/L.41.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.2, the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and the means of their delivery in the Middle East is one of the top foreign-policy priorities of the Russian Federation. That is why the Russian Federation fully supports that draft resolution. The draft resolution calls on all countries involved to contribute to establishing such a zone. The establishment of such a zone could become a strong foundation for the comprehensive resolution of issues of non-proliferation and for effective support for peace processes and stability in the region. The first important step in that process was the holding of the review conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 2010. As a State sponsor, we are very serious about our obligations when such a conference is convened. We are taking active steps to ensure that all the States of the Middle East are involved in such a conference. We think that delaying or postponing the convening of such a conference to an indefinite date in the future could have long-term negative political consequences both at the regional level and the international level, including in terms of strengthening the NPT regime.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.13, the Russian Federation voted against it. The draft resolution reflects a trend that we are seeing in adapting resolutions under the nuclear disarmament cluster to ideas put forward by individual States or groups of States. We are not against an innovative approach in the area of nuclear disarmament, and we support initiatives that genuinely contribute to reducing nuclear arsenals and strengthening the nuclear-weapon non-proliferation regime. At the same time, we think that the introduction

into and spread of the international practice leading to an excessively flexible interpretation of the basic documents in this area is unacceptable. The attempts by authors to give a new interpretation to the text of the NPT and the outcome documents of the Review Conferences have led to the emergence of texts of draft resolutions with recommendations that impose unacceptable obligations on nuclear-weapon States, for example, doing away with reservations to protocols on agreements and the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Furthermore, in the draft resolution, there is a contradictory appeal to expanding the mandate of the International Atomic Energy Agency. We think that such an approach distorts basic international agreements and could be disruptive of future dialogue on issues related to reducing nuclear arsenals and strengthening the NPT regime.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.28, the Russian Federation voted against it because we think that it is unacceptable to take out of context and selectively use certain provisions from the compromise package of 13 practical steps in the area of nuclear disarmament that was adopted in 2000 and the action plan adopted at the 2010 Review Conference. Everyone knows that the provisions of those documents are comprehensive in nature and that their various aspects are interlinked. One therefore cannot use parts of them selectively. Such an approach, together with attempts to shift the question of nuclear weapons to make it fall within the purview of international humanitarian law, is counterproductive because it contradicts the provisions of the NPT itself and the decisions of the Review Conferences.

The issue of reducing the combat readiness of nuclear weapons, by itself, does not solve anything from a practical point of view. Furthermore, it cannot be examined outside the context of military doctrines or without taking into account the realities of international

security as a whole. The authors do not even into account certain technological aspects and design specificities of national nuclear-weapon systems. To put it simply, the impossibility of verification of the so-called declared lowering of military readiness of strategic missiles basically makes the initiative in question completely useless from a practical point of view. At the same time, we would like to reiterate Russia's readiness to fulfil all our obligations under article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, including decisions that were adopted in the course of the Review Conference.

Finally, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/67/L.41, the Russian Federation overall supported the draft resolution, since we have always supported starting an international process aimed at banning nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices in the form of an fissile material cut-off treaty within the framework of a balanced programme of work from a conference convened to draft such a treaty. At the same time, we abstained in the voting on paragraph 3, which provides for the establishment of a group of governmental experts of the United Nations. Taking into account all the organizational and political factors, we think that such a step would not contribute to solving the issue before us.

Overall, on resolving the issue of the production of fissile materials, we have often put forward constructive initiatives aimed at launching the substantive work of the Conference on Disarmament as quickly as possible. We are actively trying to find ways of solving pending issues, working with our various partners — the permanent members of the Security Council, all five being nuclear-weapon States — and other interested countries. We think that it is important not only to launch negotiations on the matter, but to reinvigorate the work of the multilateral disarmament mechanism as whole.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.