



General Assembly

Sixty-sixth session

First Committee

21st meeting

Wednesday, 26 October 2011, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Viinanen (Finland)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda items 87 to 106 (continued)

Thematic discussion on item subjects and introduction and consideration of all draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and related international security agenda items

The Chair: Under agenda items 87 to 106, the Committee will take action on the draft resolutions listed in informal paper No.1/Rev.1, which has been circulated today, starting with cluster 1 on nuclear weapons.

After completing action on cluster 1, the Committee will proceed to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction", followed by the draft resolutions and decisions contained in the remaining clusters.

I would like to remind members that the Committee will follow the procedure that I outlined yesterday and that was further explained in the informal paper on ground rules. I would appeal once again to all delegations to kindly observe the procedure and to avoid any interruptions once voting on a cluster begins. Let me remind delegations again that the sponsors of draft resolutions may make general statements at the beginning of the consideration of the draft resolutions and decisions under a particular cluster, but may not make statements in explanation of their vote before or after action is taken.

Before we proceed to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, I shall give the floor to delegations wishing to make either a general statement other than explanations of vote on any of the draft resolutions or decisions in that cluster or to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. Al-Kuwari (Qatar) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to make a general statement on the draft resolutions on the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East (A/C.1/66/L.1) and the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East (A/C.1/66/L.2). I have the honour to make this statement also on behalf of the Arab Group regarding the draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". In this regard, I should say that the Arab States also welcome the draft resolution submitted by Egypt on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Given the fact that the creation of such a zone is a priority for our Group; given the risk of nuclear proliferation, the concern to which it gives rise, and other implications; and given the lack of respect Israel has shown for the relevant international treaties, we wish to raise the following points.

First, although no tangible progress has been made in this area in terms of the implementation of the resolutions, decisions and outcomes adopted by the Review Conferences of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), in particular of the lack of implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, the Arab Group continues to believe that the NPT is the cornerstone of the non-proliferation regime and disarmament.

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.



Secondly, the Arab States have always been convinced that a practical solution to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East should be based on cooperation and a comprehensive and integrated approach to non-proliferation issues in terms of the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. This is what is proposed by the Arab States and supported by the international community through the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Thirdly, the Arab States recall that Israel is the only party in the Middle East that has yet to accede to the NPT and has shown no intention of doing so, failing to subject its nuclear facilities to the monitoring system of the comprehensive safeguards agreement of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The international community has recognized this reality and has given a great deal of early attention to Israeli nuclear capabilities. In that context, the Security Council adopted resolution 487 (1981), which called on Israel to halt work on its nuclear installations and submit them to IAEA inspection.

The Arab States attach great importance to the need for a balanced activation of the three pillars of non-proliferation, aimed at general and complete nuclear disarmament, which is a permanent demand of all the Arab States. We remind the international community that it should commit firmly to that path.

Fourthly, the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East is a prerequisite if we are to establish peace and stability in the region for future generations. With this in mind, the Arab Group has the following demands.

First, we stress the need for the international community to reiterate its commitment to implementing the resolution on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 NPT Review Conference and reaffirmed in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)). The parties to the Treaty should fully assume their responsibilities for implementing that resolution in full.

Secondly, we stress the importance of pressuring Israel with all practical means and measures necessary to prevail on it to accede unconditionally to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State. We also call on Israel to submit all its nuclear facilities to IAEA monitoring.

Thirdly, we call on all Member States to participate positively in the 2012 conference on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear-weapons and weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, scheduled to be held in Finland, and to work to make the conference a significant milestone on the path to nuclear non-proliferation, with a view to freeing the Middle East of all nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction.

Ms. Balaguer Labrada (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): We would like to make a general statement on cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons". Cuba is a co-sponsor of a number of draft resolutions contained in cluster 1 on which decisions will be made today. Those include draft resolutions A/C.1/66/L.25, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons"; A/C.1/66/L.45, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger", and A/C.1/66/L.46, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons".

We reaffirm that security guarantees received to date have not been effective; thus, until we achieve the goal of total elimination of nuclear weapons, we must create a single international, legally binding judicial instrument through which nuclear-weapon States can provide non-nuclear-weapon States with security guarantees against the use or threat of use of such weapons. Such security guarantees must be universal and unconditional, and the Conference on Disarmament, as the only multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament, must make its work in that regard a priority.

The existence of more than 22,600 nuclear silos, half of which are ready for immediate use, constitutes a grave danger to humankind. Cuba has repeatedly, and at the highest levels, called for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and supports the call for a high-level international conference to reach an agreement on a programme for the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Furthermore, we believe that the concept of nuclear deterrence as a basis for unsustainable and unacceptable military doctrines should be abandoned once and for all, since, far from contributing to nuclear disarmament, it encourages the perpetual possession of nuclear weapons. Cuba reaffirms the importance of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in various

regions of the world as an important contribution on the part of States and a concrete step towards achieving the goal of nuclear disarmament.

My delegation will therefore support the draft resolutions being presented on this theme. We reiterate our firm support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. The creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that region would represent an important contribution to the goal of nuclear disarmament and mark a landmark step in the peace process in that region. To that end, Israel must sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and submit its nuclear facilities to the broad protections of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

We welcome the designation of Jaakko Laajava, Under-Secretary of State for Foreign and Security Policy of Finland, as facilitator, and of Finland as the host Government of the conference on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East to be held next year, and we hope that concrete proposals to achieve that goal will emerge from that meeting.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take decisions on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, starting with draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.1.

Before doing so, I shall give the floor to delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1 before the vote.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41, introduced by the representative of Japan, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", the representative of Japan referred to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with regard to Security Council resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009), which address the elimination of the nuclear weapons programme of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the suspension of uranium enrichment and light water reactor construction.

In that regard, I want to draw members' attention to three factors. First, the representative of Japan has no moral ground for submitting a draft resolution on the elimination of nuclear weapons. Japan is under the nuclear umbrella of the United States, the largest nuclear-weapon State, and Japan made a secret nuclear deal with the United States in 1960, which was officially confirmed last year by the Japanese Minister

of Foreign Affairs. Under that secret nuclear deal, Japan allowed United States warships carrying nuclear weapons into the territorial waters of Japan. Japan has the largest stockpiles of weapons-grade plutonium, which are over 40 tons. Japan also has ballistic missile delivery capability under the pretext of missile defence and joint research development with the United States.

Secondly, in the preambular part of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41, the Japanese text refers to Security Council resolutions relating to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea totally and categorically rejected both of those resolutions, because they singled out my country's nuclear weapons while never touching on the key creator of the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula.

In 1957, the United States introduced nuclear weapons into South Korea and since that time their number has grown to over 1,000. Since 2002, the United States has included the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on its list of pre-emptive nuclear targets. This provides strong evidence that the Security Council is biased and that it works against its own mandate, which is for peace and security. By naming only the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which is a victim of the nuclear weapons of the United States, the Security Council undermines its own credibility and authority and violates the Charter of the United Nations, which stipulates that each Member State has the sovereign right to maintain self-defence capability.

Thirdly, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea remains committed to the peaceful settlement of disputes through diplomatic means, namely the Six-Party Talks, and conversations to that end are ongoing. Yesterday, on 25 October, these talks ended in Geneva. It was a very positive move towards a peaceful settlement of the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula.

I would add that Kim Jong Il said in an interview with the Russian news agency ITAR-TASS that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is committed to a peaceful settlement through the early and speedy opening of the Six-Party Talks and is in favour of moving towards a settlement of the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula on an equal basis, in a comprehensive and full-fledged manner and through a simultaneous action-for-action process.

I ask that draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41 be put to a vote.

Mr. Lusiński (Poland): I am speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Union (EU) on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”. The candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Iceland; the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association country Norway, a member of the European Economic Area; as well as Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova, align themselves with this declaration.

We intend to vote in favour of the 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 — nuclear, chemical and biological — and their delivery systems. The EU therefore remains committed to the full implementation of the resolutions on the Middle East adopted by the Security Council and by the 1995 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). In addition, the EU supports the mechanism, as agreed by the 2010 NPT Review Conference, for the implementation of the 1995 NPT resolution on the Middle East.

We support in particular the convening by the Secretary-General and the sponsors of the 1995 Review Conference resolution, in consultation with the States of the region, of a conference in 2012, to be attended by all States of the Middle East, on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at by the States of the region and with the full support and engagement of the nuclear-weapon States. In this respect, the EU very much welcomes the recent nomination by the Secretary-General and the sponsors of the 1995 NPT resolution of Mr. Jaakko Laajava as facilitator and Finland as the host Government for the Conference.

The EU is prepared to strongly support the process towards the establishment of a weapons-of-mass-destruction-free zone in the Middle East, including through possible follow-up initiatives to the successful seminar that we held in July 2011. Furthermore, we call on all States of the region that

have not yet done so to accede to the NPT and the Chemical and Biological Weapons Conventions, 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 the draft resolution is not sufficiently comprehensive, in that it does not address all the nuclear proliferation challenges in the region. The draft resolution does not mention the serious proliferation risks related to Iran’s nuclear and ballistic programme. By violating its safeguards agreement with the IAEA, by continuing not to comply with resolutions of the Security Council and the IAEA Board of Governors, and by limiting its cooperation with the Agency, Iran has raised serious doubts within the international community about the exclusively peaceful nature of its nuclear programme.

We note with grave concern the recent developments of the Iranian nuclear programme, as reflected in the latest IAEA report, in particular Iran’s installation of centrifuges in its facility near Qom as part of plans to increase its capacity to enrich uranium to near 20 per cent. We also share the increasing concerns of the Agency about the possible military dimension of the Iranian nuclear programme. According to the Agency, these concerns are based on extensive, credible and consistent information. In resolution 1929 (2010), dated 9 June 2010, the Security Council reaffirmed that Iran must suspend enrichment-related activities and cooperate fully with the IAEA on all outstanding issues.

We remain determined and united in our efforts to work towards a comprehensive, negotiated and long-term solution that restores international confidence in the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran’s nuclear programme, while respecting Iran’s legitimate right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy consistent with the NPT. In this regard, we reaffirm the need for Iran to fully implement the resolutions of the Security Council and the IAEA Board of Governors and to cooperate fully with the IAEA in satisfactorily addressing all of its concerns, including those on the possible military dimensions of its nuclear programme, as reflected in IAEA reports.

We deeply regret that, over the past year, Iran has failed to respond to concrete and practical proposals for initial confidence-building measures made on

22 January in Istanbul by the EU High Representative on behalf of China, France, Germany, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States. We once again urge Iran to respond to Ms. Ashton's declaration of 21 September, also made on behalf of these countries.

With regard to Syria, the European Union has noted with serious concern the conclusion of the IAEA Director General in his May report to the Board of Governors that the destroyed building at the Dair Alzour site was very likely a nuclear reactor. The EU urges Syria, as required by the resolution of the IAEA Board of Governors, which reported to the Security Council Syria's non-compliance with its obligations under its Safeguards Agreement, to urgently remedy that non-compliance and fulfil its 26 May pledge to respond positively and without delay to the Director General's request that it resolve all outstanding questions and bring into force an additional protocol as soon as possible.

Ms. Rahamimoff-Honig (Israel): Every year, faced by the annual submission of the draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", Israel questions the motivation of its authors. This year, the detachment from the Middle East's sombre and dangerous realities is ever more apparent. We cannot help but wonder whether 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. Israel continuously and consistently points to that danger. With four out of five widely acknowledged cases of gross non-compliance with obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) taking place in the Middle East, while the fifth case — that of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea — is heavily involved in nuclear proliferation to the Middle East, that seems to require no great cognitive powers.

All of these cases fundamentally challenge Israel's security and cast a dark shadow as to the prospects of embarking on a meaningful regional security process. They also demonstrate the cynical way in which some regional States treat their international commitments in the nuclear domain while they and others exploit the multilateral arena and the automatic majority that exists against Israel. In that

context, we wonder whether the current turmoil and transformation processes at play in the region will shed light on the full extent of the real proliferation risks in the region.

Israel would expect that, in a draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", the international community would look closely at the cases of Iran and Syria. Those are two regional States that are under ongoing investigation by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) owing to their clandestine activities in contravention of their NPT obligations. It cannot be overemphasized that those countries have been the subject of numerous resolutions of the Security Council and the IAEA Board of Governors. At a minimum, Israel would expect a call for all States of the region to comply with their relevant international non-proliferation obligations. Lamentably, this draft resolution chooses to ignore the relevant IAEA and Security Council resolutions and the evidence contained in the IAEA reports regarding Iran's and Syria's gross violations.

Adopting such an ill-motivated and unbalanced draft resolution, which aims to single out Israel in a biased manner, will not serve the greater objective of curbing proliferation in the Middle East or contribute to the role and standing of this body in advancing peace and security in the Middle East. Similarly, it will not be consistent with the responsible behaviour that we expect of regional States and the international community at large if there is a true interest in regional security.

In the light of the aforesaid, we call upon delegations to not play into the hands of those who wish to divert attention from the real problems of the Middle East and to vote against the draft resolution. By doing so, delegations will distance themselves from attempts to hamper the efforts of the international community to effectively cope with nuclear proliferation in the region.

Finally, the fact that the sponsors of this anti-Israeli draft resolution choose to include in the text language referring to the 2012 conference proves, above all, the ill intent of the Arab States with regard to that proposed conference.

Ms. Kennedy (United States of America): My delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.2. The United States believes that again this year, the draft resolution fails to meet the

fundamental tests of fairness and balance. It confines itself to expressions of concern about the activities of a single country, omitting any reference to serious nuclear proliferation concerns in the region. The most glaring omission continues to be the lack of any reference to Iran's violation of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the relevant Security Council resolutions, as well as its failure to cooperate fully and transparently with the IAEA.

Notwithstanding our "no" vote, 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 nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. That is an achievable goal once the essential precursors are in place, including a comprehensive peace in the region and full compliance by States with their non-proliferation undertakings.

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 in 2012 on the establishment of the Middle East zone free of all weapons of mass destruction, as called for by last year's Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT. This will require that conditions be in place so that the conference can be conducted in a constructive and unbiased way. Unfortunately, raising the 2012 conference in the context of this unbalanced draft resolution hurts the prospects for such an outcome. We find that regrettable, in particular as it comes in the wake of the positive development of the announcement of a conference host and facilitator, Mr. Jaakko Laajava of Finland, whose appointment we recently welcomed.

Ms. Golberg (Canada): Canada is taking the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East" (A/C.1/66/L.2), due to the fact that, once again this year, the draft resolution unfairly singles out Israel by calling for its accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons while failing to address serious non-compliance issues by other States in the region already party to that Treaty.

Canada has taken this position both here and on similar resolutions in other forums, including the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Canada has consistently called for universal adherence to the

Non-Proliferation Treaty. Canada finds the draft resolution to be deficient because it ignores other realities, such as Iran's and Syria's non-cooperation, in particular with the IAEA. We regret, for example, that Iran has failed to comply with Security Council resolutions 1929 (2010), 1835 (2008), 1803 (2008), 1747 (2007), 1737 (2006) and 1696 (2006). Iran has chosen to ignore those Security Council obligations and the efforts of the international community to arrive at an equitable and lasting solution that would allay the concerns of the international community with regard to Iran's intentions.

In the case of Syria, it has had ample opportunity to cooperate effectively with the Agency in resolving that issue, but has thus far refused to do so. For those reasons, Canada will vote against this year's draft resolution on the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.1. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 19th meeting, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.1.

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.1/65/L.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.2. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the fifth, sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs and on the draft resolution as a whole. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 19th meeting, on 24 October 2011. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.2 and CRP.3/Rev.3.

The Secretariat would like to bring to the attention of delegations the technical correction to operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.2. The word “recalls” should be replaced with the word “welcomes”.

The Chair: The Committee will now vote on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, 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:

India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Kenya, Pakistan

The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 155 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of

Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, 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, 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:

India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Pakistan

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 160 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Mauritania and Mozambique advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland,

Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, 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, 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:

Israel

Abstaining:

India, Pakistan

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 163 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Mauritania advised 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.1/66/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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei

Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, 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, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Panama

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.2 was adopted by 157 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.3, entitled

“Follow-up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed to at the 1995, 2000 and 2010 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons”. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate recorded votes have been requested on the sixth and ninth preambular paragraphs.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.3, entitled “Follow-up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed to at the 1995, 2000 and 2010 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons” was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the 13th meeting of the Committee, on 17 October 2011. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.3 and CRP.3/Rev.2.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia,

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 110 votes to 7, with 47 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on the ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, 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, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic,

Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Canada, Israel, Japan, Monaco, Panama, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Uganda

The ninth preambular paragraph was retained by 111 votes to 7, with 44 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.3 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of),

Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, 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, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, 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, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Cameroon, China, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, India, Pakistan, Samoa, Tonga, Uganda

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.3 was adopted by 105 votes to 52, with 10 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Mauritania and Mozambique advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegations of Albania, Latvia and Monaco advised the Secretariat that they had intended to abstain.]

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/66/L.10. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/66/L.10, entitled "Missiles", was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, also on behalf of Egypt and Indonesia, at the 13th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.10.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/66/L.10 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the ninth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraphs 2, 8, 9 and 15. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", was introduced by the representative of Japan at the 12th meeting, on 14 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.41 and CRP.3/Rev.2.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on the ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.41.

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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile,

Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, 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, 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, Pakistan

The ninth preambular paragraph was retained by 165 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41.

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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, 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, 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

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 166 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 8 of A/C.1/66/L.41.

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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, 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 Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-

Leste, 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

Abstaining:

India, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic

Operative paragraph 8 was retained by 167 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41.

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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of

Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, 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, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Brazil, Ecuador, India, Israel, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Operative paragraph 9 was retained by 161 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 15 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41.

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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania,

Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, 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, 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:

Argentina, Brazil, India, Israel, Pakistan

Operative paragraph 15 was retained by 164 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41 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, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece,

Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, 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, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mauritius, Myanmar, Pakistan, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41 was adopted by 156 votes to 1, with 15 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.45. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.45, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger", was introduced by the representative of India. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.45 and A/C.1/66/CRP.3/Rev.2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, 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, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, 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, Marshall Islands, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Serbia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.45 was adopted by 110 votes to 48, with 12 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.46. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.46, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", was introduced by the representative of India. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.46 and A/C.1/66/CRP.3/Rev.2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, 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, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, 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:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.46 was adopted by 113 votes to 48, with 10 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to those delegations wishing to explain their votes or positions.

Ms. Rahamimoff-Honig (Israel): Israel has joined once again the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East". Notwithstanding our ongoing substantive reservations regarding certain elements contained in the draft, including the reference to the non-consensual resolution of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) General Conference concerning the application of IAEA safeguards in the Middle East, we have done so as Israel remains committed to a vision of the Middle East developing eventually into a zone free of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons, as well as ballistic missiles.

Nonetheless, Israel has always maintained that this issue, as all other such regional security-related issues, can be realistically addressed only within the regional context. As widely recognized by the international community, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone can emanate only from within the region. It must be based on arrangements freely arrived at through direct negotiations between

the States of the region and those directly concerned, applying a step-by-step approach.

It is clear that the creation of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), which is unprecedented, should take place under similar circumstances. This process should begin with modest confidence-building measures, which should be carefully selected so as not to detract from the security margins of any regional State. Such measures should be followed by the establishment of peaceful relations, reconciliation, mutual recognition and good-neighbourliness, and complemented by conventional and non-conventional arms-control measures. This process could, in due course, lead to more ambitious goals, such as the establishment of a mutually verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zone.

In that context, we are witnessing today a historic and significant transformation in the Middle East. While this process of transformation may yield positive results in the region, it also harbours potential risks of instability and polarization. It remains to be seen whether these developments will contribute to an atmosphere that will enable the region to embark on a regional security process.

It has been Israel's long-standing position that the essential preconditions for the establishment of the Middle East as a mutually verifiable zone free of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems are a comprehensive and durable regional peace and full compliance by all regional States with their arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation obligations.

In this context, it should be recalled that in the Middle East, unlike in other regions of the world where nuclear-weapon-free zones have been established, there are continuing threats against the very existence of one State — the State of Israel. Those threats are significantly exacerbated by the irresponsible behaviour of certain States in the region and beyond, concerning the export of WMD-related materials, technologies and know-how and the very substantive discrepancies between the non-proliferation commitment of States and their actual behaviour.

The international community should not overlook the fact that four out of five widely acknowledged cases where gross non-compliance with the NPT has occurred involve Middle Eastern States, whereas the fifth case — namely, that of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea — is deeply involved in nuclear

proliferation to the Middle East. Israel sincerely hopes that the future will yield a more stable and secure Middle East in which an environment of peace and reconciliation prevails. In that context, we hope that the positive implications of the democratization processes that have been budding in the region may offer an opportunity for a better atmosphere that could be conducive to building trust and confidence among regional parties.

Mr. Bavaud (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): Switzerland voted again this year in favour of the draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". The draft resolution (A/C.1/66/L.2) promotes the universalization of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in the region of the Middle East. Switzerland fully subscribes to that goal. We welcome the concrete measures adopted by the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT with respect to the creation of a zone free of nuclear and all other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, in particular the decision to hold a conference on this subject in 2012. In this regard, we wish to thank Finland for accepting the role of host State and Mr. Jaakko Laajava for agreeing to serve as facilitator for that event.

We also congratulate the organization by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) of a forum to be held on 21 and 22 November 2012, on experience that could be relevant to the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

As to the contents of the draft resolution just adopted, Switzerland notes that its provisions make reference only to the dimension linked to the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. By voting in favour of the draft resolution, Switzerland wishes to demonstrate the importance it attaches to the full and complete implementation of the obligations of all States under the NPT. In that context, the full cooperation of those States with the relevant international organs in this sphere, beginning with the IAEA and the Security Council, is crucial, as is the full implementation of all decisions and resolutions adopted by those bodies.

In order to implement the draft resolution and to achieve the goal of preventing the risk of nuclear proliferation on the broadest possible scale, it is imperative that States be fully cognizant of the present

context and of all developments that affect the countries of the region taken as a whole.

Mr. Woolcott (Australia): I take the floor to explain my delegation's vote on two draft resolutions, "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East" (A/C.1/66/L.2) and "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons" (A/C.1/66/L.46).

Australia is committed to preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and to the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons. As a strong supporter of 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 annual resolution calling for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free in the Middle East.

Australia places the greatest importance on implementation of the consensus outcome (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)) of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT and supports the practical steps endorsed by the Review Conference towards the convening of a conference in 2012 on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. Australia has clearly expressed its support for the efforts made by Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and the depository States, in consultation with the States of the Middle East region, for the convening of that conference next year, and has welcomed the progress made to date in that regard.

Australia's long-held view has been consistent that all States in the region should adhere to the NPT and that their nuclear facilities should therefore be subject to IAEA inspection. However, a resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East" that refers only to Israel and makes no reference to current deepening nuclear proliferation risks in the Middle East is in our view unbalanced, and we had therefore again regrettably to abstain.

As I have already indicated, Australia places the greatest importance on implementation of the consensus outcome of the 2010 Review Conference of

the NPT, including actions 7, 8 and 9 relating to security assurances. Australia, however, does not support the draft resolution on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons, which does not make reference to relevant non-proliferation norms.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation): My delegation abstained in the voting on paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41, which was introduced by the representative of Japan. That paragraph deals with the commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty. We have consistently taken the position that such negotiations must be conducted at the Conference on Disarmament. For that reason, we believe that the issue of the mandate and the venue and all other matters related to negotiations on that treaty should be decided within the context of the draft resolutions presented by the representative of Canada on a fissile material cut-off treaty and on the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. Magalhães (Brazil): I will take the floor to explain the Brazilian vote on three draft resolutions: A/C.1/66/L.41, A/C.1/66/L.45 and A/C.1/66/L.46.

The Brazilian delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". We would like to thank the delegation of Japan for its efforts to address some of the issues raised by Brazil and other delegations at last year's session of the First Committee. While we share the ultimate goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, there are important differences between the approach proposed in this draft resolution and that of other resolutions dealing with nuclear disarmament with regard to the key challenges that face the regime of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the meaningful steps that are expected of States parties, in particular the nuclear-weapon States.

We still have concerns about some specific language in the draft resolution. In paragraph 9, for instance, a reference to the Conference on Disarmament was excluded, thereby allowing for negotiations on a fissile material treaty to take place elsewhere.

Although the language in paragraph 12 has been improved, we continue to believe that the draft resolution should, in line with action 7 of the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)), express support for the

immediate commencement of discussions within the Conference on Disarmament of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, not excluding an international legally binding agreement.

With regard to paragraph 15, the Brazilian delegation would like to recall that the additional protocol is an instrument of a voluntary nature undertaken between a Member State and the International Atomic Energy Agency. The language used in paragraph 15 would have benefited from the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference, which noted that it is the sovereign decision of any State to conclude an additional protocol and that additional protocols should be universally applied once the complete elimination of nuclear weapons has been achieved.

Other changes and concepts in this year's draft resolution in a number of preambular and operative paragraphs are worthy of note. We cannot, for instance, agree to the reintroduction of some ambiguous formulations derived from article VI of the NPT, which was supposed to be clarified by the unequivocal undertaking of the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish complete elimination of their nuclear arsenals, agreed on at the 2000 NPT Review Conference. Nor should we hint that nuclear terrorism and a nuclear conflagration that could lead to the annihilation of humankind are risks of the same status. We hope that next year the sponsors will make renewed efforts to improve these points, as well as other formulations in the draft resolution that lack clarity and precision.

The Brazilian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.45, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger", because we believe that nuclear doctrines must be reviewed, as called for in paragraph 1, in order to reduce the risks of unintentional and accidental use of nuclear weapons. It is our view, however, that the most serious threat to humankind and the survival of civilization derives primarily not from the use but rather from the very existence of nuclear weapons. In this context, measures such as de-alerting and de-targeting nuclear weapons, while relevant, cannot substitute for multilateral agreements conducive to the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons.

The 2010 NPT Review Conference, in paragraph 81 of its Final Document, noted the proposals for nuclear

disarmament by the Secretary-General to consider negotiations on a nuclear-weapons convention or agreement on a framework of separate, mutually reinforcing instruments, backed by a strong system of verification. The Review Conference also noted in paragraph 82 of its Final Document that the final phase of the nuclear disarmament process and other related measures should be pursued within an agreed legal framework, which a majority of States parties, including Brazil, believe should include specified timelines. We consider that actions 3, 5 and 6 of the plan of action of the Final Document constitute the necessary way forward in promoting nuclear disarmament.

The Brazilian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.46, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", in spite of Brazil's well-known position on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons, not merely to prohibit their use. We understand that a gradual, phased programme working towards the complete elimination of nuclear weapons can be a realistic approach to the goal of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Lusiński (Poland): I am speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Union (EU) on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.3, entitled "Follow-up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed to at the 1995, 2000 and 2010 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons".

The States members of the European Union voted against this draft resolution because of the non-compliance of its sponsor with non-proliferation obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty, including those agreed at its Review Conferences. We have elaborated further on this in our explanation of vote delivered on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.2, "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

The States members of the EU abstained this year in the voting on the sixth preambular paragraph of this draft resolution. Circumstances have changed since 2009, when this text was last adopted. The EU wishes to emphasize the great importance it attaches to the steps taken towards implementing the 1995 NPT resolution on the Middle East, including through the Final Document agreed on at the 2010 NPT Review Conference (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)).

The EU particularly welcomes the convening of a 2012 conference on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear and all other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, to be attended by all States of the region. Through the change in our voting pattern, we want to send a signal to Iran, the sponsor of this draft resolution, and certainly to all other countries in the region, to fully and constructively engage in the process leading to the 2012 conference and at the conference itself.

The 2010 NPT Review Conference emphasized the requirement of maintaining parallel progress, in substance and timing, in the process leading to the achievement of total elimination of all weapons of mass destruction — nuclear, chemical and biological — in the region. We consider that the 2012 conference should contribute to the resolution of all challenges related to weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

Ms. Higgie (New Zealand): New Zealand voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”. Consistent with our belief in the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world, New Zealand is a strong and long-standing supporter of universalization of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We are committed to the realization of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, as mandated by the States parties to the NPT in 1995 and reaffirmed by their 2010 Review Conference.

We strongly support the convening in 2012 of a conference on the establishment of such a zone, and we very much welcome the recent announcement of the designation of a facilitator and host country for the conference. We note that the International Atomic Energy Agency will of course have a crucial role to play in verifying such a zone, and we therefore urge all States that have not yet done so, including in the Middle East, to sign, ratify and implement an additional protocol to allow the Agency to undertake its important work.

New Zealand wishes, however, to place on record its concern regarding the absence in this draft resolution of any reference to other States in the Middle East that present significant nuclear proliferation concerns. We would hope that this lack of balance will be addressed in future years.

Ms. Mehta (India): I take the floor to explain India's vote on two draft resolutions. On the first, A/C.1/66/L.2, “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”, India abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and voted against its fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs, while abstaining in the voting on its seventh preambular paragraph, 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 on those States remaining outside the NPT to accede to it and to accept International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards in all their nuclear activities is at variance with that principle and does not reflect current realities.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41, “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, as we cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) 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 our position on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, India abstained in the voting on paragraph 8. As India supports the commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty in the Conference on Disarmament, the question of a moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons does not arise. We therefore abstained in the voting on paragraph 9.

India has also abstained in the voting on paragraph 15. The concept of a comprehensive safeguards agreement is applicable only to non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT. India has concluded an India-specific safeguards agreement with the IAEA and a protocol additional to that agreement.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation on two draft resolutions, entitled “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East” and “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”, contained in documents A/C.1/66/L.1 and A/C.1/66/L.2 respectively.

As is well known, based on Iran’s initiative in 1974, over the past 37 years the General Assembly has without interruption adopted a resolution endorsing the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and recognized that such a zone would greatly enhance international peace and security. Likewise, the Assembly, in the historic Final Document of its first special session devoted to disarmament, held in 1978, we affirmed that

“[p]ending the establishment of such a zone in the region, States of the region should solemnly declare that they will refrain on a reciprocal basis from producing, acquiring or in any other way possessing nuclear weapons and nuclear explosive devices and from permitting the stationing of nuclear weapons on their territory by any third party, and agree to place all their nuclear activities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards” (*resolution S-10/2, para. 63 (d)*).

However, it is a source of grave concern that, despite the repeated calls of the international community — and in particular by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, the Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as well as the successive summits and ministerial conferences of the Non-Aligned Movement — the Zionist regime, as the only non-party in the region which has officially acknowledged the possession of nuclear weapons and enjoyed the full support of the United States and certain Western countries, in particular in the so-called Security Council and elsewhere, has neither acceded to

the NPT nor placed its unsafeguarded nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the IAEA. Consequently, no progress has been made so far towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

As the Zionist regime is the only source of threat and the only obstacle to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, we firmly believe that at the 2012 conference on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, there should be strong pressure on that regime to eliminate all its nuclear weapons, to accede to the NPT without further delay and without any condition as a non-nuclear-weapon party, and to place all its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards in order to pave the way for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

It is ironic that countries such as Canada, members of the European Union (EU) or the United States, which have kept deadly silent on the clandestine nuclear weapons programme and unsafeguarded nuclear installations of the Zionist regime, make baseless allegations against Iran’s exclusively peaceful and safeguarded nuclear programme, all of which we have categorically rejected. The United States and members of the EU, which either have nuclear weapons or are hosts of nuclear warheads in clear violation of the NPT and which have been in non-compliance with the NPT for years, are not entitled to express concern over Iran’s exclusively peaceful nuclear programme.

Ms. Kennedy (United States of America): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.3, I take the floor to explain that, notwithstanding the United States’ negative votes on the draft resolution as a whole and the sixth and ninth preambular paragraphs, we continue to support the resolution on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and, of course, the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)), which, I would remind the Committee, covers all three pillars of the NPT.

However, the draft resolution as a whole reflects a lack of balance and integrity that makes it impossible for us to support it in whole or in part. It is cynical for the primary sponsor, a State that is in non-compliance with its NPT obligations, to try to dictate follow-up

with disarmament obligations. Iran should demonstrate its own commitment to the NPT in word and deed by complying with its own obligations.

Mr. Suljuk Mustansar Tarar (Pakistan): I will explain Pakistan's votes on three draft resolutions, A/C.1/66/L.2, A/C.1/66/L.3 and A/C.1/66/L.41, separately.

On the draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", contained in document A/C.1/66/L.2, my delegation continues to support the primary focus of the draft resolution. However, the persistent emphasis in the draft text on the recommendations and conclusions emanating from various Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), in our view, remains lopsided. Moreover, we are disappointed at the continued but unrealistic call on Pakistan to join the NPT. Our position on this subject is clear and needs no elaboration. My delegation therefore went along with the draft text as a whole while abstaining in the voting on its fifth, sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs.

My delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/66/L.3, entitled "Follow-up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed to at the 1995, 2000 and 2010 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons". Pakistan, as a non-party to the NPT, neither subscribes to nor is bound by the conclusions and decisions of the Treaty, including those relating to universality.

Lastly, with regard to our explanation of vote on the draft resolution entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", contained in document A/C.1/66/L.41, my delegation does not agree with several provisions of the draft resolution. In accordance with our clear and consistent position, we cannot accept the call to accede to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State without conditions, nor do we consider ourselves bound by any of the provisions, including those adopted by the NPT Review Conferences or other forums in which Pakistan is not represented. While my delegation supports the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, it cannot agree to some of the proposals in the draft resolution, such as the immediate commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty, which are selective, discriminatory and unrealistic.

In view of those reservations, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and on the ninth preambular paragraph, and voted against paragraphs 2, 9 and 15.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to elaborate on that country's position concerning draft resolutions A/C.1/66/L.1 and A/C.1/66/L.2. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea voted in favour of both draft resolutions in reflection of the strong support of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Since 1974, that has been an overdue issue in the Middle East. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea firmly believes that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East will greatly contribute to lasting peace and security in that region.

As far as the nuclear policy of Israel is concerned, it is a major obstacle to progress towards the establishment of such a zone and has been a major source of proliferation in the region. It is an open secret that Israel is armed with nuclear weapons, that it pursues a policy of neither confirm, nor deny and that once, or on several occasions, a very mysterious nuclear test was detected by a certain country.

Mrs. Balaguer Labrada (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

Cuba has always maintained a clear, transparent and consistent position in favour of nuclear disarmament, which for our country is the highest priority in the area of disarmament. We believe that specific measures leading to general nuclear disarmament should be adopted on a verifiable and non-discriminatory basis. My delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole because we believe that it lacks the substantive elements to effectively achieve that objective.

Meanwhile, with regard to the fifteenth preambular paragraph, we believe that everyone is aware of the intrinsic complexities of that delicate issue and that the decisions taken in the Security

Council in that regard do not help to solve the problem. That is a body of known limited composition and in which the strongest Powers have been able to act politically so as to give it a selective approach of double standards in the treatment of nuclear non-proliferation. That has led, in some cases, to the adoption of sanctions and coercive measures in that body, while, in other cases, the realities are ignored and the Security Council is inactive and silent.

We reiterate our rejection of the attempt to impose on this Committee narrow visions that have little to do with the negotiated and multilateral solutions that should prevail in the approach to international issues. We firmly believe that diplomacy and dialogue through peaceful means should continue with a view to achieving a long-term solution to the nuclear issue in the Korean peninsula. Moreover, we reiterate our deep concern about the slow movement towards nuclear disarmament and the lack of progress by nuclear-weapon States on the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to those representatives wishing to speak in right of reply.

Mr. Amano (Japan): In response to the allegations made by the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea against Japan prior to the voting, I would like to state that each and every one of them is utterly groundless.

In that connection, I would like to draw the attention of the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the fact that draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.41, including the fifteenth preambular paragraph, was adopted by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Concerning the remarks of the Japanese representative, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea totally rejects the allegation made by that representative.

Japan is under the nuclear umbrella of the United States. It is aligned with foreign warships carrying nuclear weapons in its territorial waters and in more than 10 military bases belonging to the United States. The nuclear-armed and nuclear-powered submarines, nuclear-powered aircraft carriers and the most sophisticated delivery means of nuclear bombs, including the most recent F-35, which is under ongoing discussion for purchase by the Japanese Government,

all explain how the Japanese Government is steadily set on becoming a nuclear Power.

The Chair: We have now concluded today's action on cluster 1, on nuclear weapons.

The Committee will now proceed to cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction".

I shall now give the floor to those delegations wishing to make either a general statement, other than an explanation of vote on any draft resolution or decision in cluster 2, or to introduce draft resolutions.

I give the floor to the representative of Hungary to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.32.

Mr. Nagy (Hungary): Hungary, following the practice of previous years, wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.32, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction".

The draft resolution was submitted for the Committee's consideration on 13 October 2011. The text of the draft is based on the resolutions that were adopted in recent years and updated to include the latest developments, with a special focus on the upcoming seventh Review Conference of the States parties to the Convention, to be held in December 2011. Before submitting the draft resolution, Hungary held several rounds of informal discussions on the text in Geneva and in New York. We tried to accommodate the views expressed by the States parties in those consultations in order to reflect the general sentiments and wishes of the States parties in relation to the Convention.

No sooner had we submitted the draft resolution to the Committee for consideration than the news of Burundi joining the Convention was announced by the delegation of the United Kingdom, one of the depositaries of the Convention. The date of entry into force is 18 October. Taking into consideration this increase in the number of States parties, Hungary would like to make two minor oral amendments of a technical nature to the draft text published in document A/C.1/66/L.32 to reflect this development.

In the first line of the second preambular paragraph, the number of States parties should read "one hundred and sixty-five"; the paragraph should therefore read as follows:

“Noting with satisfaction that there are one hundred and sixty-five States parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, including all the permanent members of the Security Council”.

The first line of paragraph 1 should also be adjusted accordingly; the paragraph should read as follows:

“Notes with appreciation that two additional States have acceded to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, reaffirms its call upon all signatory States that have not yet ratified the Convention to do so without delay, and calls upon those States that have not signed the Convention to become parties thereto at the earliest possible date, thus contributing to the achievement of universal adherence to the Convention”.

With these oral amendments, Hungary wishes to remain the sole sponsor of the draft resolution on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, and hopes that it will be approved by the Committee without a vote.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 2.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.19, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction”, was introduced by the representative of Poland at the 13th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.19.

The Chair: The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that the draft 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.1/66/L.19 was adopted.

The Chair: We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.32.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.32, entitled “Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction”, was introduced by the representative of Hungary. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/66/L.32.

With the permission of the Chair, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.32. This oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.32, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to render the necessary assistance to the depositary Governments of the Convention and to provide such services as may be required for the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Review Conferences, and to render the necessary assistance and provide such services as may be required for the seventh Review Conference.

The attention of the Committee is drawn to the fact that the States parties to the Convention, at their annual meeting in December 2010, approved the cost estimates prepared by the Secretariat for the servicing of the seventh Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee in 2011. Similarly, it is expected that the seventh Review Conference will approve the cost estimates for servicing any intersessional meetings of the Convention that the Review Conference may commission for the period 2012-2015.

It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties that under their respective legal arrangements ought to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations, may be undertaken by the Secretariat only once sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in the meetings. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.32 would not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

Also, the representative of Hungary has just introduced an oral revision by which the draft would reflect the accession of additional States to the Convention.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.32, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.48.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.48, entitled “Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction”, was introduced by the representative of India at the 13th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.48 and CRP.3/Rev.2.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.48 was adopted.

The Chair: I now give the floor to representatives who wish to explain their positions on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have two explanations of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/66/L.19 and A/C.1/66/L.48.

My delegation joined the consensus adoption of the draft resolution entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction” contained in document A/C.1/66/L.19. However, the Islamic Republic of Iran, as the greatest victim of the use of chemical weapons in contemporary history, attaches great importance to the full implementation of the Convention and would like to place on record that the total destruction of all chemical weapons stockpiles and their production facilities remains the key objective of the Convention, while the continued existence of chemical weapons threatens international peace and security and

undermines the integrity and credibility of the Convention. In our view, ensuring full compliance by major possessor States parties with the final extended deadline of 29 April 2012, is of vital importance.

Accordingly, the possessor States parties shall embark on sustained and accelerated efforts, as required by the eleventh session of the Conference of States Parties to the Convention and within the framework of the Chemical Weapons Convention and its verification regime, towards full compliance with their obligations under the Convention. Otherwise, the *raison d'être* of the Convention will be seriously challenged and its credibility significantly tarnished. Should the major possessor States parties, in particular the United States, which has adequate resources for the destruction of its stockpile, fail to meet the final extended deadline, that will be viewed as non-compliance.

Regrettably, this draft resolution lacks an accurate reflection of that important aspect of the implementation of the Convention. My delegation, while joining the consensus on the draft resolution this year, will vigorously pursue the issue of full compliance of the possessor States parties with their obligations in due course.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.48, entitled “Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction”, the Islamic Republic of Iran has always supported measures to confront terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. In that context, we have supported this resolution since its introduction by India to the First Committee.

However, the draft proposed this year contains a reference to the so-called Nuclear Security Summit, a closed, selected gathering to pursue a selective approach to nuclear security based on the assumption that the possession of nuclear weapons by a few countries should be continued and that the only major problem is how to secure the weapons and necessary materials for their production. A thorough reading of the documents from that gathering shows that there is not a single word about nuclear disarmament or the total elimination of nuclear weapons, which is the only absolute guarantee against the threat posed by nuclear weapons. Furthermore, for a nuclear-weapon State to host the aforementioned meeting to go outside the United Nations, draft some documents and come back

to the United Nations for their endorsement is the wrong approach to multilateral issues.

Despite full sympathy for the thrust of the draft resolution, the reference to that gathering in the current text obliged my delegation, while joining the consensus, to disassociate itself from the paragraph contained therein on the so-called Nuclear Security Summit.

Mr. Suljuk Mustansar Tarar (Pakistan): I take the floor to explain Pakistan's vote on the draft resolution entitled "Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction", contained in document A/C.1/66/L.48.

My delegation shares the concerns that terrorists and non-State actors may potentially acquire and use weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). We therefore support the objectives of the draft resolution, although we continue to believe that its language could have been improved to convey a more objective reflection of reality. The fear of the acquisition and use of WMD materials by terrorists and non-State actors needs to be evaluated and viewed in perspective. Terrorist organizations or non-State actors are more likely to acquire and use chemical and biological weapons-related materials and capabilities. The acquisition and use of nuclear weapons by terrorists and non-State actors are much less likely. The international community must, however, not lower its guard to prevent the possibility of the development and use of dirty bombs.

Increased international cooperation, including the initiation of negotiations on a radiological weapons convention, should be given serious consideration. Such concerns should not, however, become an excuse for pursuing a policy of discrimination against selected countries.

With regard to the denial of means to terrorists to acquire, possess and use WMDs, States have enacted and enforced export control measures and national physical protection and have taken other related actions to prevent WMD technology from falling into the hands of terrorists.

International assistance and capacity-building continue to be important areas of attention. To lend greater legitimacy to international efforts in those areas, interim measures, such as the adoption of Security Council resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673

(2006), which were designed to fill the gap in international law, need to be taken up by a more inclusive and representative United Nations forum.

We agree with the widely held view that the best guarantee against the threat of possible use of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons lies in their elimination. The faithful implementation of existing treaty regimes, such as the Chemical Weapons Convention, can effectively address most such threats. An early disarmament of chemical stocks would enhance confidence concerning the likelihood of their acquisition and use by terrorists. However, as long as the process of chemical weapons disarmament proceeds at a slow pace and huge quantities of chemical weapons exist, the possibility of their falling into terrorists' hands shall remain as well.

Controlling biological weapons should be of more concern, particularly to the industrially advanced States, due to their extensive use of biological agents. The Biological Weapons Convention should therefore be strengthened, including the possibility of concluding a verification protocol, which has been in negotiation for over eight years. We are convinced that a revival of that process would fully serve the goal of promoting international peace and security, and address the concerns expressed, for example, in draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.48.

We are convinced that a comprehensive strategy must be developed to prevent the possibility of terrorists gaining access to weapons of mass destruction. That strategy must include depriving terrorist organizations of their operational and organizational capabilities, strengthening the relevant existing multilateral regimes, and negotiating a universal treaty to fill the gaps in current international instruments. It must also augment State capacities to implement global treaty obligations and address the root causes of terrorism. A distinction must be maintained between counter-terrorism and non-proliferation.

The draft resolution quite appropriately mentions the final document of the Fifteenth Non-Aligned Movement summit as having spoken out on weapons of mass destruction and terrorism. We would like to recall that, in the context of the issue of terrorism, the same document also stresses the need to address causes — causes that sometimes lead to terrorism, and causes that lie in suppression, injustice and deprivation.

The Chair: The Committee has thus concluded action on cluster 2.

We will now move on to cluster 3, “Outer space: disarmament aspects”. There is one draft decision, A/C.1/66/L.11, and one draft resolution, A/C.1/66/L.14.

Before the Committee takes action on the draft decision and draft resolution in cluster 3, I shall give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements, explain their votes before the voting, or to introduce a draft resolution.

Mrs. Balaguer Labrada (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): In cluster 3, “Outer space: disarmament aspects”, Cuba is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.14, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”. Were it to occur, an arms race in outer space would pose a grave threat to international peace and security. For that reason, Cuba believes that it is proper and necessary to continue developing international measures that promote transparency and confidence in outer space matters.

Cuba values this text as a significant contribution to efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space, including specific measures, such as prior notification, verification and follow-up, to achieve greater transparency in space activities.

At the same time, Cuba believes that the Conference on Disarmament should play the central role in negotiating a multilateral agreement on the prevention of an arms race in outer space in any form. We hope that, as in previous years, the draft resolution will be adopted with the support of member States.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft decision A/C.1/66/L.11. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/66/L.11, entitled “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities” was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 14th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/66/L.11.

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.1/66/L.11 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.14. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.14, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”, was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 14th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/66/L.14 and CRP/Rev.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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore,

Slovakia, Slovenia, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.14 was adopted by 171 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee has thus concluded its action on cluster 3.

We will now move on to cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”. There is one draft resolution, A/C.1/66/L.36.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.36. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.36, entitled “Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus”, was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 15th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.36 and CRP.3/Rev.2.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.36 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now move on to cluster 5, “Regional disarmament and security”, which contains four draft resolutions.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.5. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.5, entitled “Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace”, was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 18th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.5 and CRP.3/Rev.2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.5 was adopted by 124 votes to 4, with 45 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.26, “Regional disarmament”. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.26, entitled “Regional disarmament”, was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 15th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.26 and CRP.3/Rev.2.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.26 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.27, “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.27, “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”, was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 15th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.27 and CRP.3/Rev.2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 133 votes to 1, with 31 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Poland advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.27 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Poland, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.27 was adopted by 165 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Poland advised 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.1/66/L.28, "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context". I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.28, entitled "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 15th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/66/L.28 and Rev.2.

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 shall take it that the Committee decides to proceed accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.28 was adopted.

The Chair: I now call on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of position or vote on draft resolutions under cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security".

Mrs. Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): As it did in the previous session, my delegation decided to abstain in the voting on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.27, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

As we have already indicated, our concerns are centred on two aspects. First, Mexico believes that the

development of conventional arms control principles lies outside the purview of the Conference on Disarmament, not only because of the subject matter involved, but also because the issue is not part of the Conference's mandate as a negotiating forum. In any event, the issue should be considered by the United Nations Disarmament Commission, given its deliberative nature.

Secondly, Mexico believes that the ongoing paralysis and current working methods of the Conference on Disarmament make it impossible to include an additional item for consideration in its agenda, such as the issue referred to in the paragraph under discussion.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.27 on conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels. Russia is in favour of developing disarmament, control and confidence-building processes for conventional weapons at the regional and subregional levels. Once all interested States have reached agreement, such mechanisms would help to enhance regional peace and security and facilitate the release of funds for socially important goals.

To that end, there is no doubt about the need to adapt such instruments in a timely manner to the changing situation in the field of security. The sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution refers to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe as a cornerstone of European security. The Treaty has not reflected international realities for a long time, however, as it was concluded during the Cold War period and was designed to maintain the balance of power between the former Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact States, on the one hand, and NATO on the other. The Treaty is undoubtedly obsolete, as the world has changed significantly since that time.

Russia therefore proposes conducting negotiations in an appropriate format so as to reach a new, legally binding treaty that could help to enhance security in the region.

Mr. Singh Gill (India): India voted against draft resolution A/C.1/66/L.27 on conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels, which requests the Conference on Disarmament to consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control.

The Conference, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, is responsible for negotiating disarmament instruments of global application.

In 1993, the United Nations Disarmament Commission adopted by consensus guidelines and recommendations for regional disarmament. Therefore, there is no need for the Conference on Disarmament to engage itself in the formulation of principles on the same subject, at a time when it has several other priority issues on its agenda.

Furthermore, we believe that the security concerns of States extend beyond narrowly defined regions. Consequently, the notion of preserving a balance in defence capabilities in the regional or subregional context is unrealistic and unacceptable to our delegation.

Mr. Ja'afari (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): The representative of Israel, a nuclear-weapon State that refuses to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and to place its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, has made two statements this evening that are characteristic of nuclear terrorists and insult the intelligence and the safety of people and nations.

There is global unanimity on the fact that the only true nuclear threat in the Middle East region is Israel's possession of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, which are capable of reaching distant targets in the region. Nevertheless, some parties continue to demonstrate their arrogance by launching into a series of sterile arguments to back up allegations that are completely baseless, insincere and non-objective, which makes their true intentions plain for all to see and reveals the lie of their declared support for the creation of a zone free of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

The representative of Israel cannot throw stones from her country's glass house. Israel continues to refuse to comply with numerous United Nations resolutions, as it has done for decades. There are hundreds of such resolutions. Similarly, it refuses to accede to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State and to place all its facilities under the IAEA safeguards regime. We wish to remind those who close their eyes to that fact that the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT mentioned Israel alone when speaking of nuclear-weapon States in the Middle East

region. Israel was described as being the party responsible for hampering the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

We deem it regrettable to have to hear words that confirm an undeclared alliance with Israel. That is what we have gleaned from the statement made by the representative of Poland, who spoke on behalf of the European Union. The fact that he called into question the position of my country regarding cooperation with the IAEA is wrong, provocative and out of step with reality. They consider that Israel is not responsible for nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. The representative of Poland is in no position to offer advice to or criticism of others. I would remind him that the member States of the EU are themselves failing to respect their non-proliferation obligations as a result of the presence of nuclear weapons on their territory and of their direct or indirect cooperation — declared or undeclared — with Israel, by providing it with nuclear technology and radioactive, biological and chemical substances.

Syria acceded to the NPT in 1968, before many of the EU States did. It is deeply committed to the provisions of the NPT and of the safeguards agreements concluded with the IAEA. It hosts IAEA inspectors on a regular basis, and all IAEA reports have stressed Syria's full cooperation.

The Canadian representative did not take into account the statements we have made in the past few days. The Canadian statement confirms our concerns once again in that once again, for the umpteenth time,

she is playing devil's advocate and acting out a theatrical European role, instead of calling on Israel to accede to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State and place its facilities under IAEA comprehensive safeguards.

This is clear proof of the fact that Canada approves of nuclear proliferation and the possession of nuclear weapons by Israel. We would remind the Canadian representative yet again that her country provided funding, scientific experts, materials and technology to the Manhattan Project, which oversaw the creation of the first nuclear bomb ever used. Did her country contribute to the decision to use that bomb? We are still waiting for an answer to that question and to others to which she did not want to respond.

Those lies and false allegations on the issue of nuclear weapons do not help us make progress in this sphere.

The Chair: I should like to remind delegations that we will meet again tomorrow to continue to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security". We will go through informal paper 1 first and then through informal paper 2, which was distributed to representatives today.

I thank all delegations for their active participation and I also thank the interpreters for their flexibility.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.