



General Assembly

Sixty-eighth session

First Committee

24th meeting

Monday, 4 November 2013, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Dabbashi (Libya)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Agenda items 89 to 107 (continued)

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

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): The Committee will continue its discussion of draft decisions and resolutions in cluster 1.

I now give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. Rowland (United Kingdom): Several of the drafted resolutions remaining to be voted on in this cluster contain references to the humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. The United Kingdom shares the deep concern at the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons, as expressed by States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) at their 2010 Review Conference.

The United Kingdom continues to attach the greatest importance to avoiding the use of nuclear weapons and supports and participates in a range of efforts to increase international resilience to the threat of nuclear terrorism. The United Kingdom stands by its commitments on disarmament and the undertakings set out in article VI of the NPT, which is the cornerstone of the global proliferation and disarmament regime. The United Kingdom has a strong history of nuclear disarmament and continues to strive towards the goal

of a world without nuclear weapons through the NPT and the action plan agreed at the 2010 NPT Review Conference. The United Kingdom strongly supports a step-by-step approach to nuclear disarmament, which is wholly consistent with NPT objectives and agreed by all NPT States parties at successive NPT Review Conferences and in the 2010 action plan.

The United Kingdom is concerned that some efforts under the humanitarian consequences heading appear to be aimed increasingly at a nuclear-weapons convention prohibiting the possession of nuclear weapons. The United Kingdom believes that any attempt to establish a new conference or body to discuss such approaches risks undermining the full implementation of all three pillars of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which should remain our priority. The United Kingdom is determined to continue to work with partners across the international community to control proliferation, to make progress on multilateral nuclear disarmament, to build trust and confidence between nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States, and to take tangible steps towards establishing a safer and a more stable world in which countries with nuclear weapons feel able to relinquish them.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I now give the floor to the representative of Indonesia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1.

Mr. Percaya (Indonesia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. On this occasion, I would like to recall that the Movement has submitted a draft resolution on the follow-up to

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.

13-54498 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament, contained in document A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1.

The draft resolution aims to strive for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In that context, through the draft resolution, the General Assembly would call for the urgent commencement of negotiations, in the Conference on Disarmament, for the early conclusion of a comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons to prohibit their possession, development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer and use or threat of use, and to provide for their destruction.

Secondly, it would request the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States with regard to achieving the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, in particular on the elements of a comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons, and to submit a report thereon to the General Assembly at its sixty-ninth session, and also to transmit the report to the Conference on Disarmament.

Thirdly, the Assembly would decide to convene, no later than 2018, a United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament to review the progress made in this regard.

Fourthly, it would declare 26 September as the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons devoted to furthering this objective, including through enhancing public awareness and education about the threat posed to humanity by nuclear weapons and the necessity for their total elimination, in order to mobilize international efforts towards achieving the common goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world.

The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) convened an informal consultation on the draft resolution in early October, when a large number of delegations expressed their views on the draft. Furthermore, NAM engaged in consultations with several groups of States, as well as individual countries bilaterally. In those consultations, two important issues were raised. The first was a request to include the concept of the humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. The second centred on the importance of making explicit reference to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

After consideration of the request and proposals, NAM member States decided to accommodate the two issues. Therefore, new paragraphs were inserted in the

draft resolution as the tenth and eleventh preambular paragraphs. As a result, a revised version of the draft resolution was issued to reflect the two following preambular paragraphs.

The tenth preambular paragraph reads as follows:

“Sharing the deep concern at the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons, and in this context reaffirming the need for all States at all times to comply with applicable international law, including international humanitarian law”.

The eleventh preambular paragraph reads as follows:

“Mindful of the solemn obligations of States parties, undertaken in article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, particularly to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament”.

The incorporation of these references serves as further substantiation that the proposals put forward would in fact reinforce the NPT objective of nuclear disarmament, and support substantive work of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating body on the topic. In that regard, and with a view to achieving tangible progress towards the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons, the Movement seeks the support of all Member States and their vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Under cluster 1, I wish to make a general statement on draft resolutions A/C.1/68/L.36, entitled “Nuclear disarmament”, and A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1, entitled “Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”.

My delegation is of the view that draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.36 on nuclear disarmament, among all the draft resolutions before the First Committee, addresses most comprehensively the issue of nuclear disarmament, which is and must remain the highest disarmament priority. The draft resolution deals with significant matters connected, *inter alia*, to the needs, obligations and commitments related to the objective of achieving nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Moreover, this year the draft resolution also welcomes the successful convening of the first high-

level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament. As follow-up to the high-level meeting, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) has introduced draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1, entitled “Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”. At that meeting, it was proposed that 26 September be designated the international day for the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

The new draft resolution submitted by NAM outlines a new approach to the proposal to promptly launch negotiations on nuclear disarmament within the Conference on Disarmament. As part of this new initiative, three items on the agenda on the Conference on Disarmament — including nuclear disarmament, fissile material for nuclear weapons, and negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States — would be merged. All of these would come together in an umbrella convention banning nuclear weapons that would include also the prohibition of the acquisition, development, use, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use of such weapons, and would provide for their destruction. Member States have been requested to submit their comments on this issue for the report to be presented by the Secretary-General on this subject.

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1 is a good-faith initiative that also seeks to break the deadlock in the Conference on Disarmament. We hope that all Member States, in particular those that have expressed their concerns over the deadlock in the disarmament machinery, will support the draft resolution.

We reiterate that nuclear disarmament cannot be an objective that is continually subjected to conditions and postponement. Nuclear-weapon States must commit to halting their development of these weapons and to withdrawing them immediately from the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States. At the same time, we reiterate that the only guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons will be their total elimination. We hope that draft resolutions A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1 and A/C.1/68/L.36 will enjoy the support of Member States.

Mr. Khazaee (Islamic Republic of Iran): I believe that draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.36 is one of the most important texts before us today and deserves the full support of all of us.

Nuclear weapons are the greatest threat to our lives, to the lives of our children, to the present and future generations, to the security of our planet and to

all humankind. The total elimination of these inhumane weapons is the only absolute guarantee against their threat or use. Before they consume us altogether, we must consume them altogether. This is not an option, but a must. It is both our right and responsibility. We must do whatever we can to fulfil this long-overdue legal obligation.

The first-ever high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament, held in September, was a step in the right direction. The extensive participation of the Heads of State and Government and other dignitaries in the high-level meeting, and their strong support for nuclear disarmament, indicated that this issue remains the highest priority for all of us. We need to invest further political will to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world at the earliest possible date. We should take advantage of the momentum created by the high-level meeting to take forward multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

The three point action-oriented proposal presented by President Rouhani of the Islamic Republic of Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) has enjoyed wide support both at the high-level meeting and in the First Committee. We look forward to the strong support of all Member States for a NAM draft resolution containing these proposals. The draft resolution is in full support of international efforts within the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and has the potential to overcome the current situation in the Conference on Disarmament.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I call on the representative of New Zealand to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.29/Rev.1.

Ms. Crowley (New Zealand): It gives me great pleasure, on behalf of Mexico, New Zealand and Australia, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.29/Rev.1, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”. We are particularly pleased to see so many sponsors of the draft resolution, which highlights the extensive cross-regional support enjoyed by the Treaty. Revision 1 has been issued because of the addition last week of a new preambular paragraph welcoming the establishment of a group of eminent persons to complement efforts to secure ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty by the remaining annex 2 countries and to support the article XIV process.

We commend the draft resolution to the Committee and look forward to its adoption again this year by an overwhelming majority of Member States.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to support the introductory statement made by the representative of Indonesia. At the same time, I would like to clarify the position of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1, entitled "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament".

First, the draft resolution is the full reflection of the successful convening of that meeting and the support expressed therein for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The meeting was held at the initiative of the Non-Aligned Movement and gained broad support for nuclear disarmament as the highest priority and for the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Secondly, the draft resolution fully reflects the ongoing deadlock in the field of nuclear disarmament. Nuclear disarmament, as previous speakers have already said, is a must. It is a pressing need and task for all humankind in order to guarantee international peace and security, but the reality is otherwise. This category of weapons is the most destructive in the world, but without any international norms, which are desperately needed, there is still not even an initial basis for beginning negotiations.

Nuclear weapons continue to exist and their stockpiles continue to grow, while modernization continues non-stop. Moreover, the largest nuclear-weapon State, which holds the record of being the first country to drop such deadly weapons on the heads of the people of a certain country, has persistently espoused the doctrine of first nuclear strike against other countries. It also continues to deploy those deadly weapons on the territories of other countries and outside its own territory, giving rise to great concern and fear among the other countries of the world. Therefore, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea insists that the total elimination of nuclear weapons should remain the top priority and task and that there should be internationally binding legal instruments.

In that regard, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea fully supports the draft resolution.

Mr. Zauli (Brunei Darussalam): On behalf of the States members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) — namely, Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam, I have the honour to introduce to the Committee the biennial draft resolution entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)", contained in document A/C.1/68/L.39/Rev.1.

We are pleased to inform the Committee that the draft resolution is sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Bangladesh, China, Colombia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Fiji, France, Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Timor-Leste, Tonga, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Uzbekistan.

This year's draft resolution is based on resolution 66/43, adopted by consensus at the sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly, and contains a number of updates following developments that have taken place over the past two years, including the extension of the Plan of Action to strengthen the implementation of the Bangkok Treaty for another five years, from 2013 to 2017, adopted in Bandar Seri Begawan on 30 June. Following the submission of the draft resolution on 17 October, a note verbale was issued on 23 October, informing all Permanent Missions of additional changes made to paragraph 3, as reflected in A/C.1/68/L.39/Rev.1.

ASEAN believes that nuclear-weapon-free zones play a significant role in strengthening global nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament norms, and that they consolidate international efforts towards peace and security. ASEAN also sees the importance of the Bangkok Treaty as a contribution to the nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament regime and as an instrument for peace, security and prosperity in the region.

The draft resolution underscores the unwavering commitment of ASEAN to preserving South-East Asia as a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. That is the aspiration of ASEAN, as enshrined in the ASEAN Charter and in the Bangkok Treaty itself. This commitment has been reaffirmed by our leaders on many occasions, and most recently

earlier this year at the twenty-second and twenty-third ASEAN Summits, held in Brunei Darussalam.

As reflected in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, ASEAN will continue to engage nuclear-weapon States to resolve comprehensively, in accordance with the objectives and principles of the Treaty, outstanding issues, with a view to signing the Protocol of the Bangkok Treaty and its related documents as early as possible. ASEAN believes that the signing of the Protocol by all nuclear-weapon States would lead to establishing a region free of all nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. It would also promote South-East Asian security by stabilizing a non-proliferation regime that enhances regional confidence and cooperation. Moreover, signing the Protocol is in line with the obligation of nuclear-weapon States under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to promote the spread of regional nuclear-weapon-free zones and to provide security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States.

In closing, ASEAN would like to once again thank those countries that have co-sponsored the draft resolution. We look forward to its adoption by consensus in the First Committee and subsequently in the plenary of the sixty-eighth session of General Assembly.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I give the floor to the representative of Myanmar to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.36.

Mr. Wai (Myanmar): On behalf of 44 Member States and in my delegation's capacity as the main sponsor, I would like to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.36, entitled "Nuclear disarmament".

Nuclear disarmament has been and remains a high priority on the disarmament agenda of my country. In line with its priority and commitment, Myanmar, together with other like-minded Member States, once again introduces the draft resolution on nuclear disarmament.

The unanimous decision of the International Court of Justice states that there exists an obligation for all States to pursue in good faith and to bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control. We firmly believe that nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons are the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

The draft resolution therefore calls for the full and effective implementation of the 13 practical steps towards nuclear disarmament adopted at the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the full implementation of the 22-point action plan on nuclear disarmament contained in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. The draft resolution reiterates its call upon nuclear-weapon States to undertake the step-by-step reduction of the nuclear threat and to carry out effective nuclear-disarmament measures with a view to achieving the total elimination of those weapons within a specified time frame.

Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, the draft resolution again calls on nuclear-weapon States to assure non-nuclear-weapon States, through a legally binding instrument, that they will not use or threaten to use their nuclear weapons. This year's draft resolution calls for actions to be taken by nuclear-weapon States in order to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons. Such steps warrant immediate action.

In conclusion, we would like to invite all Member States to work together to realize a nuclear-weapon-free world by voting in favour of the draft resolution.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): Before proceeding to take action on the draft resolutions under cluster 1, entitled "Nuclear weapons", I give the floor to those representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position before the voting.

Mr. Farghal (Egypt): Egypt will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", as it believes that the draft resolution could have benefited from a more balanced approach.

The omnibus draft resolution aims to achieve universal commitment and a balanced multilateral framework for global and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament. Instead, it includes selected elements of the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Such selectivity disregards Egypt's international and regional priorities, as reflected in the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference, including ignoring the priority of establishing a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction.

In addition, the eleventh preambular paragraph, which welcomes the deliberations and results of the

second session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference, is not accurate, as it does not reflect the fact that the second session failed to reach consensus on its report and therefore did not succeed in adopting an agreed outcome in line with the rules of procedure. The Egyptian delegation engaged in good faith with the sponsors in order to address those concerns. Unfortunately, our comments were not taken into account.

Finally, Egypt recognizes nuclear disarmament as its highest priority. We consider that that objective can be achieved only through a balanced and comprehensive approach that takes into account all legitimate concerns.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Our delegation would like to explain its position before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". The Democratic People's Republic of Korea will vote against the draft resolution sponsored by Japan for the following reasons.

First, the draft resolution contains elements that do not correctly reflect the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula. The uranium-enrichment programme and light water reactor construction of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are intended for peaceful purposes, that is, the generation of electric power. Access to nuclear energy is granted to all States. Many countries enjoy that benefit. Some countries develop indigenous nuclear fuel cycles and set up a self-supporting nuclear-power industry. The draft resolution does not voice concerns over the peaceful nuclear activities of other States. It expresses concern, in the strongest terms, only about a single country, which, I doubt, arises purely from goodwill.

The draft resolution also states that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea cannot have the status of a nuclear-weapon State under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is not a party to and is not bound by the NPT. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea withdrew from the NPT and manufactures nuclear weapons for the purpose of deterring an attack by the United States and of defending its sovereignty because the United States designated the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as a target for a pre-emptive nuclear attack. The United States is nevertheless trying to convince people that the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula means only the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's

dismantlement of its nuclear programme, while falsely arguing that restarting the Yongbyon nuclear facility violates our international obligations and commitments. The United States thereby aims to cover up its crimes and to shift the responsibility to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Secondly, Japan is unqualified and is not in a position to talk about the elimination of nuclear weapons. The Japanese people were the first civilians to suffer the catastrophic consequences as a result of the atomic bombs dropped by the United States of America. Now, however, in return for its active support of the United States' hostile policy towards the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan has emerged as a dangerous force of war and aggression. However, Japan's three non-nuclear principles are just a deception. Every year, United States nuclear aircraft carriers and submarines freely go in and out of Japan's territorial waters. Excessive levels of plutonium have accumulated. Political figures raise their voices calling for the nuclear weaponization of Japan.

The denuclearization of the Korean peninsula is the inviolable policy aim of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's Government, which does not mean unilateral nuclear dismantlement by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea Government. Denuclearization is the process of making the Korean peninsula a nuclear-weapon-free zone on the basis of completely removing the substantial nuclear threats posed to the peninsula from the outside, on the principle of simultaneous actions.

Action for action remains a basic principle for finding a solution to the nuclear issue on the peninsula, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will therefore not move first unilaterally. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea delegation regards the draft resolution introduced by Japan as being full of prejudice, distortion and hypocrisy, and will vote against it.

Mr. Jiménez (Nicaragua) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the draft entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", contained in document A/C.1/68/L.43. Nicaragua supports the contents of the draft resolution, given its profound concern over the catastrophic humanitarian consequences resulting from any use of nuclear weapons.

As a nuclear-weapon-free country, my country also has the moral authority to demand that nuclear

stockpiles be eliminated in order to ensure a little more safety and security on this planet. That is why we support the request to ask nuclear-weapon States to reduce and ultimately eliminate all types of such weapons, emphasizing the importance of the principles of irreversibility, verifiability and transparency. Furthermore, we welcome the draft resolution's recognition of the legitimate interests of non-nuclear-weapon States in receiving unequivocal and binding security assurances from the nuclear-weapon States. We also support the reference to the right of every State to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

As regards the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula, we reiterate the call made by our President, Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra, to promote peace by the pacific means established in the Charter of the United Nations, such as dialogue and negotiation, and for all parties to the conflict to shoulder their responsibility and meet their obligations in an equitable way that would allow the reunification of the Korean peninsula step by step and in good faith. It is in that spirit that my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Ovsyanko (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): I wish to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.34, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations". Belarus has carefully considered the draft resolution and notes a number of positive elements that have been included by the sponsors.

Belarus affirms its principled support for the multilateral process of nuclear disarmament with the participation of all interested parties. In that context, we underscore that the Conference on Disarmament is a unique forum for negotiating the issues of disarmament and international security. Belarus supports the resumption of substantive work at the Conference, and the resolution of incongruities resulting from the imbalance in States' interests and the different visions on how to ensure national and regional security.

Redressing the situation through international consensus will require substantial time and effort. In that respect, a great deal remains to be done to enhance mutual trust between nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States. The rule of consensus regarding all of the Conference's decisions is a guarantee that all interests will be taken into account and that the national security of participating States will be upheld in the

exclusivity and universality of the documents drafted by the Conference.

Mindful of that, Belarus will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.34. We are, however, ready to cooperate with all interested States, including the sponsors of the draft resolution, to achieve results that would promote progress in multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation wishes to state its position before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

The Russian Federation continues to believe that the Japanese draft resolution is the most balanced text in the cluster of the First Committee's draft resolutions on nuclear disarmament. However, unlike in previous years, the Russian delegation will be forced to abstain. The problem is that the text contains not only editorial amendments, but also additions that have altered the content of the document and had a negative impact on its balanced nature.

First and foremost, this concerns the addition in the preambular part of a new paragraph on the humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. The Russian Federation is convinced that the humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons — the total annihilation of human civilization — are evident. In our view, it would be cynical to require any type of confirmation of this sad truth or to introduce additional deliberations on this topic.

Of course, we do not want to try to dissuade anyone from discussing the humanitarian consequences. If anyone needs their memory refreshed regarding the utter nightmares of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the perilous Cold War that followed them, that might indeed be a useful exercise. Russia, however, does not intend to participate in such discussions. We merely wish to draw the attention of our near neighbour and good partner, Japan, and of the other sponsors of the draft resolution to the fact that, if we seriously wish to make substantive progress towards nuclear disarmament, our energy and resources allocated to this purpose must focus on creating conditions conducive to the further, step-by-step movement towards comprehensive and full disarmament, pursuant to article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Shifting attention to the humanitarian consequences of the use

of nuclear weapons diverts the international community from seeking answers to real, pressing issues in nuclear disarmament.

On another issue, we note in paragraph 15 of the draft resolution a shift away from the spirit and letter of Security Council resolution 2094 (2013). All of us will recall that the call to implement the Joint Statement of 19 September 2005 was addressed not only to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. That is why it would similarly be appropriate to focus not only on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43, but to refer to the obligations of all participants in the process.

The Chair: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1, entitled "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1 was just introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1.

With the permission of the Chair, I would like to read out the following oral statement on financial implications, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 6 and 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6, the General Assembly would decide

"to convene, no later than 2018, a United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament to review the progress made in this regard" [and request] "the Secretary-General to make all necessary arrangements to commemorate and promote the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons".

Pursuant to paragraph 6, the organizational aspects and dates of the conference are yet to be determined. Therefore, in the absence of modalities for meetings and documentation of the conference, it is not possible at the present time to determine the conference-servicing requirements. As soon as specific decisions on the dates, format, scope and modalities are made, the matter will be reported to the General Assembly in

accordance with rule 153 of its rules of procedure. The dates of the conference will have to be determined in consultation with the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management.

Pursuant to paragraph 8, it is anticipated that the activities of the Secretariat in support of the commemoration and promotion of the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons would be met within the provisions for section 4, "Disarmament", under the regular budget. Therefore, there will be no programme budget implications associated with those activities.

Should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6, the Secretary-General will submit the details of financial implications, if applicable, in accordance with the established procedures when the modalities of the international conference are determined.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan,

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1 was adopted by 129 votes to 28, with 19 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.29/Rev.1, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.29/Rev.1, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”, was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 12th meeting, on 21 October, and the revisions were introduced just now by the representative of New Zealand. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.29/Rev.1 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.4. In addition, Singapore has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.29/Rev.1.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

India, Israel, Mauritius, Pakistan

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 170 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.29/Rev.1, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

India, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.29/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 175 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.34, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.34, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations", was introduced by the representative of Costa Rica at the 11th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.34 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.4.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay,

Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Andorra, Belarus, China, Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.34 was adopted by 151 votes to 4, with 21 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.36, entitled “Nuclear disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.36 was introduced by the delegation of Myanmar. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.36 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.4.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 16 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.36. We shall first take action on paragraph 16.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina

Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, 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, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Pakistan

Abstaining:

Armenia, France, Israel, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 16 was retained by 168 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.36, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Armenia, Austria, Belarus, India, Ireland, Japan, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Montenegro, New Zealand, Pakistan, Republic of Korea,

Russian Federation, Serbia, South Africa, Sweden, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.36, as a whole, was adopted by 117 votes to 44, with 18 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.39/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Brunei Darussalam. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.39/Rev.1 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.4. In addition, Montenegro has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.39/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.39/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43 was introduced by the representative of Japan at the 10th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.43 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.4.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraphs 2, 8, 9 and 17 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43. I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Mauritius, Pakistan

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 168 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Operative paragraph 8 was retained by 171 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 9.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Ecuador, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 9 was retained by 166 votes to 3, with 8 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 17.

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

South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, 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, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mauritius, Pakistan, Uganda

Operative paragraph 17 was retained by 167 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43, as a whole, was adopted by 164 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to delegations that wish to take the floor in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Sano (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.36, entitled "Nuclear disarmament".

Japan shares the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, which is the focus of the draft resolution. However, in order to steadily implement concrete measures for nuclear disarmament, we attach the greatest importance to united actions by the international community, including the nuclear-weapon States. In that regard, there remains a difference between my country's view and the approach of the draft resolution.

Mr. Simon-Michel (France) (*spoke in French*): I shall deliver three explanations of the vote, the first two on behalf of a group of countries, and the third in my national capacity alone.

First, I would like to deliver an explanation of vote on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom and my own country, France, on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1, entitled “Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”. The United States, the United Kingdom and France took part in the High-level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament in good faith. Our three countries delivered both national and joint statements. Unfortunately, the draft resolution does not reflect the views that we expressed on 26 September or, in our opinion, the views of many other States that participated.

We believe that nuclear proliferation and the failure of a few States to comply with their respective obligations constitute the most serious threat to international security and peace, and we therefore regret that the High-level Meeting did not address nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in a balanced manner. Success in halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons is one of the international conditions that will promote step-by-step progress towards the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament.

The only reference to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in the draft resolution is insufficient, incidental and unbalanced. In addition, we remain puzzled that there is no reference to the 2010 action plan. The NPT is the cornerstone of the non-proliferation regime and the basis for nuclear-disarmament efforts. The 2010 action plan is the best road map for progress in multilateral nuclear disarmament. We are concerned that some States appear to be moving away from the consensus reached in 2010.

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

nuclear disarmament in the multilateral context was an FMCT.

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

I now shall make a further explanation of vote on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom and my own country, France, on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.34, “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiation”.

With respect to the General Assembly Open-ended Working Group, our view remains that we already have a sufficient number of forums for a discussion on how to take the multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations forward, including those identified at the 1978 special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament: the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament.

Last year, we expressed our concern over the coherence between that initiative, the NPT and its 2010 action plan. The NPT is the cornerstone of the non-proliferation regime and the basis for our nuclear-disarmament efforts. The concerns we expressed last year were valid. The 2010 action plan failed to get a single mention in the final report of the Open-ended Working Group (A/68/514). The step-by-step approach on which the disarmament pillar of the action plan rests is presented as a mere option among others. The urgent need to start negotiations on the FMCT was downplayed as one of many options. The substantial and unwarranted focus on other, parallel processes detracts from the consensus-based approach embodied in the action plan, which provides a realistic and balanced way forward on all three NPT pillars. We remain concerned by processes that focus solely on nuclear disarmament, whereas the NPT covers all three pillars in a balanced manner.

We see little value in asking States to provide the Secretary-General with comments on how to take forward multilateral nuclear-disarmament negotiations. That, to our understanding, was the purpose of the report of the Open-ended Working Group for those who wanted to contribute to it. Another report will not advance nuclear disarmament. Instead, it will only duplicate and undercut similar work being done by the

Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission and in the framework of the NPT, whose Preparatory Committee will meet again in April 2014. That is why our three countries have voted against the draft resolution.

I shall now speak in my national capacity on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43, entitled “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”. My country voted in favour of the draft resolution, which reflects in general terms France’s commitments in respect of nuclear disarmament. Nevertheless, I should like to underline my country’s concerns regarding the evolution of the text over the past three years and our wish to continue to see the NPT action plan, which was adopted by consensus in 2010, reflected in a balanced manner.

My country believes that draft resolutions brought before the General Assembly should duly acknowledge the efforts of the nuclear-weapon States in this sphere. My country is also fully aware of the serious consequences of the potential use of nuclear weapons. It is in the interests of all nations to avoid that. Let me also recall that France considers nuclear weapons not as battlefield weapons but as a means of deterrence designed for the exclusive purpose of protecting our vital interests. The French deterrence doctrine is strictly defensive and rigorously limits cases in which nuclear weapons could be used to extreme circumstances of legitimate self-defence, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

France’s priority in the field of nuclear disarmament lies in the implementation of concrete measures that correspond to a realistic and progressive approach, as embodied in the NPT action plan adopted by consensus in 2010. That is the only way to strengthen our collective security in a concrete manner. France will continue to do its utmost to work for a safer world for all and to create the conditions for a nuclear-weapon-free world in accordance with the goals of the NPT.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): I wish to explain my country’s position on four draft resolutions, the first of which is contained in document A/C.1/68/L.29/Rev.1, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”.

Over the years, Pakistan has consistently supported the objectives of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). Accordingly, we have long voted in favour of this draft resolution in the First Committee and have done so again today. My delegation continues

to believe that the objective of the call in the draft resolution for the promotion of signatures and ratifications leading to the Treaty’s entry into force will be facilitated when major erstwhile proponents of the CTBT decide to ratify it. The acceptance of CTBT obligations on a regional basis in South Asia will also help expedite its entry into force.

The draft resolution welcomes the conclusions and recommendations of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We wish to reiterate that we do not consider ourselves bound by any of the provisions that emanate from the NPT Review Conferences or from any other forum in which Pakistan is not represented. Therefore, my delegation, which in the spirit of flexibility voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, was constrained to abstain in the voting on the sixth preambular paragraph.

My country’s position on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/68/L.34, entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”, is that Pakistan has always supported nuclear disarmament and the goal of attaining a world without nuclear weapons. We continue to agree with elements of the draft resolution, particularly the frustration over the lack of progress on nuclear-disarmament negotiations. We note that the sponsors of the draft resolution have decided not to propose the re-establishment of the Open-ended Working Group, a measure that had obliged us to abstain in the voting on the resolution last year because the Working Group would weaken the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. Therefore, the decision not to reconstitute the Working Group is a step in the right direction and has also enabled us to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

For several years, Pakistan has drawn the international community’s attention to the erosion of the global consensus underpinning the disarmament and non-proliferation regime. We recognize that there are continuing differences in approaches, perspectives and modalities to overcome the challenges in that important area. We have therefore been calling for a renewal of the global consensus by harmonizing and reconciling those differences. We continue to believe that the best way forward is to convene the fourth special session of the General Assembly on disarmament so that not only the objectives and agenda of nuclear disarmament

are advanced, but also so that the entire disarmament machinery can also be revitalized.

I shall now explain Pakistan's vote on the draft resolution entitled "Nuclear disarmament", contained in document A/C.1/68/L.36. Nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons are goals that Pakistan has supported consistently. My delegation agrees with several elements of the draft resolution, including, inter alia, the call for the establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament, the conclusion of a legally binding instrument on negative security assurances, and the need to take into account the security interests of all States while negotiating disarmament treaties.

However, we cannot agree to calls for the full implementation of the action plan adopted at the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT because of our well-known position on the Treaty. We therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution. Paragraph 16 calls for the immediate commencement of a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) negotiations. It is indeed ironic that a draft resolution on nuclear disarmament should choose to reflect only the non-proliferation aspect of the Treaty talks. That anomaly notwithstanding, Pakistan, in line with its clear and unambiguous position on an FMCT, decided to vote against that paragraph.

Finally, regarding our explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", we continue to disagree with several of its provisions. In accordance with our clear and consistent position, we reject the unrealistic call to accede without condition to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State. At the same time, we do not 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. Pakistan supports the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, which is a key goal of the draft resolution.

There are also several elements of the draft text with which my delegation agrees. Having said that, we cannot agree to the immediate commencement of FMCT negotiations on the grounds that we have explained in detail, including in prior meetings of the Committee. However, it is curious that a draft resolution seeking united action towards the elimination of nuclear weapons should call for addressing the non-proliferation aspect of only fissile material. As for the universalization of

a comprehensive safeguards agreement, we wish to underscore that such a measure applies only to States that have assumed legal obligations based on their free consent.

In view of the reservations I have outlined, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and on paragraphs 2 and 17, and voted against paragraph 9.

Mr. Varma (India): I wish to deliver India's explanations of vote on four draft resolutions. I will begin with draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.34, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations".

India voted in favour of the draft resolution. Last year, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution, principally due to our concerns over the impact of that body on the established disarmament machinery. India participated in the meetings of the Open-ended Working Group this year, based on the highest priority we attach to nuclear disarmament. We are satisfied that the consensus report of the Open-ended Working Group (A/68/514) reflects India's points submitted during the proceedings of the Group, including reference to the action plan on nuclear disarmament proposed by India in 1988 and the need for an agreed multilateral framework to take forward nuclear disarmament. We are thankful to the sponsors and the Chair of the Open-ended Working Group, Ambassador Dengo of Costa Rica, for their approach to the discussions of the Group. We also appreciate the manner in which the sponsors drafted the text.

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

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.36, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", India attaches the highest priority to nuclear disarmament. We share the main objective of the draft resolution, which is the complete

elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified timetable. We were constrained, however, to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution because of certain references to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), on which India's position is well-known.

However, our vote should not be seen as demonstrating opposition to other provisions of the draft resolution, which we believe are consistent with the position of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (NAM) and India's national position on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Those provisions include references to the Outcome Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2); NAM summit statements; the 1996 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice; the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified framework of time; the role and work of the CD, including the establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament in the CD as the highest priority; the negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) in the CD on the basis of the Shannon mandate; and the call for convening an international conference on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects at an early date, to identify and deal with concrete measures for nuclear disarmament. We compliment Myanmar for retaining vital principled positions in the draft resolution that are supported by the vast majority of countries.

On draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)", India joined the adoption of the text without a vote. India respects the sovereign choice of non-nuclear-weapon States to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones based on arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. That principle is consistent with the provisions of the first special session devoted to disarmament and with the 1999 guidelines of the Disarmament Commission (A/54/42) referred to in the draft resolution.

India enjoys friendly and productive relations with all countries of the South-East Asian region. We respect the sovereign choices of the States parties to the Bangkok Treaty. As a nuclear-weapon State, India has conveyed an unambiguous assurance that it will respect the status of the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone.

Lastly, regarding draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of

nuclear weapons", India remains committed to the goal of global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament in a time-bound framework. We have stressed the need for a step-by-step process underwritten by a universal commitment and an agreed multilateral framework for achieving global and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament. In substantive terms, the draft resolution falls short of that objective.

India voted against paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, as we cannot accept the call to accede to the 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 its position on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, India abstained in the voting on paragraph 8. As India supports the commencement of negotiations on an FMCT in the Conference on Disarmament, the question of a moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons does not arise. We therefore also abstained on paragraph 9. We also abstained on paragraph 17 because the concept of a comprehensive safeguards agreement is applicable only to non-nuclear-weapon States party to the NPT. India has concluded an India-specific safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency and signed a protocol additional to that agreement.

Mr. Van der Kwast (Netherlands): I speak on behalf of the following countries: Albania, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Poland, Slovakia, Sweden and my own country, the Netherlands, to explain our vote against draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1, entitled "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament".

Our delegations fully share the long-term goal of the draft resolution, namely, a world free of nuclear weapons. Each of our delegations supported the holding of and participated in the high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament, on 26 September. During the meeting, we discussed various perspectives on how to best achieve our shared goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world. We regret that the various proposals made during the high-level meeting

were not captured in the draft resolution and that only one particular viewpoint appears to have been brought forward. Our delegations would highlight some additional concerns presented in the text.

The draft resolution includes only a limited reference to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), a seminal instrument for the achievement of a nuclear-weapon-free world. We welcome the decision of the drafters to include reference to article 6 of the NPT, but we would have preferred to see a broader reference to the Treaty as a whole.

As laid down in the NPT Final Document, the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons is indeed the best guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We are concerned that the aim of the proposed 2018 meeting is unclear. It can be interpreted as either simply another high-level meeting on disarmament to ensure continued profile to the issue, or as a potential vehicle to negotiate a nuclear-weapons convention. A nuclear-weapons convention, in our view, would be regrettable, as it may undermine our collective efforts to seek a positive outcome for the 2015 Review Conference of the NPT and may lay a foundation for an alternative pathway that could damage the NPT.

While the draft resolution rightly calls for the urgent commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament (CD), it points to only one core issue. We share the frustration expressed in the draft resolution that the CD has not been able to adopt or implement a programme of work for over 15 years. We continue to call for the adoption of a comprehensive and balanced programme of work within the CD that would allow us to advance the four core issues. We are also firmly convinced that starting negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention without the participation of the nuclear-weapon States would not advance our shared goal of disarmament.

Finally, it is our firm belief that neither the United Nations nor the cause of nuclear disarmament is helped by yet another international day, and we regret that consideration could not have been given to reinforcing existing days that are devoted to encouraging disarmament, promoting non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

Mr. Shen Jian (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to briefly explain its vote on five draft resolutions.

China has always stood for and advocated the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. China supports the purpose and objective of draft resolutions A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1, entitled "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament", and A/C.1/68/L.36, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", and voted in favour of both. At the same time, China believes that nuclear disarmament should uphold the principles of maintaining the global strategic balance and stability and undiminished security for all. All issues related to nuclear weapons, including their possible use, should be addressed in the framework of existing multilateral disarmament mechanisms.

All States parties should fulfil their obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in a comprehensive and balanced manner. Countries with the largest nuclear arsenals should continue to take the lead in making drastic and substantive reductions in their nuclear weapons. When conditions are ripe, other nuclear-weapon States should also join the multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. In order to attain the ultimate goal of complete and thorough nuclear disarmament, the international community should develop, at the appropriate time, a viable, long-term plan composed of phased actions, including the conclusion of a convention on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.18, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", China supports its purpose and objective. However, since part of the draft resolution goes beyond agreed language from the action plan and the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference of the States Parties to the NPT, China abstained in the voting.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.34, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations", China believes that the international nuclear disarmament process should proceed in the framework of existing multilateral disarmament mechanisms. Such institutions as the Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission have provided appropriate venues for addressing nuclear-disarmament issues. Establishing new mechanisms to deal with nuclear disarmament would only undermine the authority of existing ones and divert limited resources, and cannot guarantee the participation of all

major stakeholders. Therefore, China abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.34.

Lastly, with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43, entitled “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, China does not support paragraph 9 of the draft concerning declaration of a moratorium on the production of fissile material for any nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. China believes that that would not contribute to promoting the start of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty in the Conference on Disarmament (CD) at an early date. China therefore voted against that paragraph and abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole. At the same time, China reaffirms its firm support for launching negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty in the CD as soon as possible and is ready to make consistent efforts to that end.

Mr. Noonan (Ireland): I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the delegations of Austria, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Malta, New Zealand and San Marino, regarding draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1, entitled “Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”.

Having participated at a senior political level in the High-level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament on 26 September, our delegations joined the call of the overwhelming majority of States for more urgency, focus and a new momentum for nuclear disarmament. Our delegations therefore strongly support the disarmament objectives behind the draft resolution. In deciding to support the draft, we would like to stress several points of particular relevance and importance to us.

We see draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1 as being entirely consistent with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), article VI of which requires the pursuit of

“effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control”.

The draft resolution is also consistent with the action plan agreed without a vote at the 2010 Review Conference of the States Parties to the NPT, which covers all three pillars of the NPT. Action 1 of the plan obliges States parties to pursue policies that are fully

compatible with the NPT and with “the objective of achieving a world without nuclear weapons”.

Any discussion or initiative aimed at furthering efforts towards achieving and maintaining a world free of nuclear weapons should take account of the fact that, currently, the Non-Proliferation Treaty contains the only multilateral, treaty-based commitment to disarmament. That was underscored clearly in the 13 practical steps agreed by consensus at the 2000 NPT Review Conference, which included an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals, leading to nuclear disarmament, to which all States parties are committed under article VI. That unequivocal undertaking was reaffirmed by the nuclear-weapon States at the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

Our delegations believe that any efforts towards a world completely free of nuclear weapons should reinforce those obligations and support their full implementation. We are therefore pleased that, in addition to recalling the United Nations Millennium Declaration (resolution 55/2) — a document in which the Heads of State and Government resolved to strive for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons — resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1 also benefits from an explicit reference to the NPT, and specifically to the solemn obligation of States parties undertaken in article VI of the Treaty.

Our delegations further believe that any initiative aimed at advancing nuclear disarmament should give due prominence to the important ongoing discussion regarding the humanitarian consequences of any nuclear detonation, reflecting the fact that at this First Committee meeting, 125 States — representing a majority of the United Nations membership — associated themselves by name with the statement delivered by New Zealand during the thematic debate on nuclear weapons. We believe that the humanitarian consequences of a nuclear-weapons detonation should remain among the foremost precepts that guide and inform the process of nuclear disarmament. We are therefore pleased that draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1 acknowledges States’ deep concern at the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons, whether such use should occur by accident, miscalculation or design.

In supporting draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1, our delegations do not see a comprehensive convention

as being the only option available for advancing the achievement and maintenance of a world free of nuclear weapons. We wish to underline the fact that we would be favourably disposed towards any set of effective measures to achieve the objective of complete nuclear disarmament and the maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons, regardless of how such measures might be elaborated. We would particularly like to emphasize that, consistent with our obligations under article VI of the NPT, we remain willing to engage in and pursue negotiations in good faith towards the drafting of any such measures.

Finally, we welcome the decision to convene no later than 2018 a follow-up meeting to the High-level Meeting of 26 September. We see such a conference, in particular, as an opportunity to take stock of and to give new impetus to efforts towards achieving and maintaining a world without nuclear weapons.

Mr. Seifi Pargou (Iran): I would like to explain the position of my country regarding draft resolutions A/C.1/68/L.34 and A/C.1/68/L.43.

First, I would like to explain the vote of my delegation on the draft resolution entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”, as contained in document A/C.1/68/L.34. We voted in favour of the draft resolution since it deals with nuclear disarmament, which is the highest priority of the international community in maintaining and enhancing regional and international peace and security. However, we would like to put on record our views on some of the points contained in the draft resolution.

Although the draft resolution is entitled “Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations”, the several references to non-proliferation weakens its main focus on nuclear disarmament. The reference to the High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on Nuclear Disarmament, held on 26 September, is completely appropriate. However, using the word “wish” to explain the international community’s view towards progress on nuclear disarmament is not factual and is therefore unacceptable. As stated in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly (resolution S-10/2), nuclear disarmament is the highest priority of the international community. Therefore, it is not a wish but the highest priority of the international community. That principle should always be reaffirmed and supported in all international disarmament forums.

The phrase “welcomes the report of the work of the open-ended working group, reflecting the discussions and proposals made during its deliberations”, as contained in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, shows the divergent views and positions of the States participating in the Open-ended Working Group and should not be interpreted as an endorsement of the Group.

We appreciate the contribution of civil society, research and awareness-raising towards nuclear disarmament. However, we do not support the way in which it has been reflected in paragraphs 6 and 7. There is no doubt that negotiations on nuclear disarmament are exclusively the responsibility of States. Moreover, we would like to stress that negotiations on nuclear disarmament should be carried out in the relevant international body. Therefore, the extension of that issue to other United Nations bodies under any pretext is not acceptable.

The reference to the Open-ended Working Group in paragraph 9 is not, in our view, a decision on its future work. Consequently, any possible decision with regard to the Working Group should be considered in a comprehensive manner in the future, taking into account the latest developments in the field of nuclear disarmament within the Conference on Disarmament. The Islamic Republic of Iran fully supports all multilateral activities aimed at the realization of nuclear disarmament. We actively participate in the work of the Open-ended Working Group. By introducing a working paper containing our views and proposals, we contributed to its discussions and its report (A/68/514).

Finally, I would like to stress that we would not support any decision that undermines directly or indirectly the mandate, authority or rules of procedure of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating body or that replaces the mandate of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Now, I would like to explain the position of my delegation on the draft resolution entitled “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, as contained in document A/C.1/68/L.43.

In line with the overwhelming majority of States, the Islamic Republic of Iran believes that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against their threat or use. Accordingly, we share the main objective of the draft resolution, which

is the call for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. However, the text has been drafted in a manner that diverts from its objective, weakens its focus and makes it unbalanced, *inter alia*, for the following reasons.

First, the draft resolution highlights issues such as nuclear security as if it were much more important than nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Secondly, we agree with the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which highlights

“further advancement in nuclear disarmament will contribute to consolidating the international regime for nuclear non-proliferation, which is, *inter alia*, essential to international peace and security”.

However, we cannot accept linking the fulfilment of nuclear disarmament obligations with the enhancement of international peace and security, as the draft resolution does, though implicitly.

Thirdly, while it deals with a broad range of issues, for example even making reference in some paragraphs to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, a topic that is far from its main thrust, as well as certain regional issues, the draft resolution falls well short of covering some relevant and important issues. For instance, there is not a single reference to the threat of the nuclear activities of the only State in the Middle East not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the need to expedite international efforts for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that volatile region.

Fourthly, while the draft resolution refers at length to many efforts at the international level, from the High-level Meeting on revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament in 2010 and its follow-up in 2011 to the meeting of the Open-ended Working Group in 2013 and even a specific national statement, unfortunately it refers to the 2013 High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on Nuclear Disarmament in a very inappropriate manner. It was the first-ever meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament convened with the participation of almost 100 Heads of State and Government or Foreign Ministers of States Members of the United Nations.

Fifthly, in reference to the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the draft resolution focuses only in a biased manner on the fissile material cut-off treaty, while neglecting, in particular, its very viability and

scope. It fails to mention the urgency of negotiations on a nuclear-weapons convention that enjoys the full support of the overwhelming majority States Members of the United Nations and is fully in line with the main thrust of the draft resolution, that is, the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

My delegation was therefore obliged to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Kim Ju Song (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I would like to make a brief intervention explaining our position on two draft resolutions.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea voted against draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.29/Rev.1, entitled “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”, because of its unviable position rejecting Security Council resolutions 1718 (2006), 1874 (2009) and 2094 (2013). Those resolutions are the product of the high-handed arbitrariness and double standards of the Security Council. The Security Council remains silent about the nuclear war exercises aimed at the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, taking place deep inside the Korean peninsula every year. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea conducted nuclear tests as a measure of self-defence.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is serious about joining the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), due to the unique security situation on the Korean peninsula. The primary focus of the CTBT is non-proliferation. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea holds the differing view that more attention should be given to taking practical steps towards nuclear disarmament, which is at the top of our Government's agenda and that of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM).

Secondly, our delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.36, “Nuclear disarmament”, as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea aligns itself with NAM's principled position on nuclear disarmament, which remains of the highest priority. Nuclear disarmament should precede non-proliferation because the root cause of proliferation is the threat of the use of nuclear weapons. The total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute solution. Those nuclear Powers that possess the largest nuclear arsenals should lead the disarmament process in all sincerity. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea delegation supports the primary focus of the draft resolution, and therefore voted in favour.

Ms. González-Román (Spain): I would like to make a general explanation of vote in connection with action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1, "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level Meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament". I am speaking on behalf of Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece, the Republic of Moldova, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia and my own country, Spain.

Last year, our delegations voted in favour of resolution 67/39 and took part in the high-level meeting on nuclear disarmament on 26 September (see A/68/PV.11). However, this year, regrettably, we cannot give our support to draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1, since not all the positions expressed in the high-level meeting and in other forums were taken into account and reflected in the follow-up draft resolution. For that reason, we decided to abstain.

We believe in a world free of nuclear weapons and consider that disarmament and non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing goals that should be pursued through successes and gradual steps involving all nuclear-weapon States in the process. We would like to stress the fundamental role we attach to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as the cornerstone of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime and to its complete implementation. We should now direct our efforts towards moving forward with implementation of the action plan adopted by the May 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT with a view to a successful 2015 Review Conference. In that context, we see the convening of another review conference in 2018, as set out in the draft resolution, as parallel and possibly distracting our focus from the NPT review in 2015.

We appreciate the reference to the NPT in the preambular part of the draft resolution, but the emphasis is on only one of the pillars. In our view, nuclear disarmament is directly linked to the strengthening of the non-proliferation regime, and there should therefore not be a selective approach to NPT obligations. Achieving progress in those commonly shared goals requires the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the commencement of negotiations of a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

We agree that the Conference on Disarmament (CD) should start work as soon as possible. However, we would not see a nuclear-weapons convention as the first priority in the CD. We should rather aim at

a comprehensive and balanced programme of work, including on the four core issues of the Conference on Disarmament. As agreed at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the CD would be a single negotiating body in disarmament affairs, and it is unclear to us whether the conference in 2018 would be in contradiction with that consensual decision. We believe in a cooperative and inclusive approach in order to make real progress in nuclear disarmament.

Finally, we share the concern of the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons. Yet, banning nuclear weapons will not guarantee their elimination. Only by recognizing both the security and humanitarian dimensions of nuclear weapons will we be able to achieve our goal of a world free of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Tissot-Daguette (Switzerland): I am taking the floor to make an explanation of vote regarding draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1, entitled "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament".

Last year, the General Assembly responded to the lack of progress on nuclear disarmament by taking a number of initiatives, including the convening of a High-level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament. That event, held on 26 September 2013 (see A/68/PV.11), was attended at the senior political level and saw a strong expression of support for renewed efforts towards the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. The High-level Meeting proved to be an event of particular significance, and my delegation deems that it is important to build on the momentum created at that meeting.

Switzerland remains convinced that in taking the process forward, we should aim at acting in a collective and inclusive way and at uniting the United Nations membership in pursuit of the shared goal of nuclear disarmament. In that respect, Switzerland's vote in favour should be seen as a constructive step to seek common ground in full concurrence with its position on other resolutions on the subject matter.

While it has voted in favour of the draft resolution, my delegation would also like to underline the following points of substance. The draft resolution welcomes the convening of the High-level Meeting and underlines the strong support expressed on that occasion for taking urgent and effective measures to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In doing so, we

see the draft resolution as fully consistent with the broad support expressed at the High-level Meeting that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), with all its three pillars, constitutes the cornerstone of efforts towards nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. In that context, we would also have liked to see explicit reference to the NPT outcome documents, including the 2010 action plan.

Referring to article VI of the NPT, the draft resolution calls for urgent compliance with the legal obligations and the fulfilment of the commitments undertaken on nuclear disarmament. We firmly believe that nuclear disarmament will become a reality only if all States possessing nuclear weapons move resolutely in that direction and fully commit themselves to that objective. As nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing and inherently linked, any new case of proliferation of nuclear weapons would put further progress on nuclear disarmament at risk. Thus, the draft resolution's call for urgent compliance with the legal obligations and the fulfilment of the commitments undertaken on nuclear disarmament also extends to the need for strict compliance with non-proliferation obligations.

Furthermore, my delegation does not see a comprehensive nuclear convention as the only option for achieving and maintaining a world without nuclear weapons. The exchange at the High-level Meeting indicated that different approaches are possible when seeking to fulfil that objective. That fact is also underscored by the report of the Open-ended Working Group on nuclear disarmament that met earlier this year. The development of several building blocks may be necessary before a nuclear weapons convention can become a reality. In that regard, Switzerland welcomes the opportunity provided by the draft resolution for States to submit to the Secretary-General their views with regard to achieving the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In its response, it will, among other things, further spell out its views on the different approaches towards a world without nuclear weapons.

Finally, we see the United Nations high-level international conference to be convened in 2018 as a meeting of the General Assembly that will offer the opportunity to take stock of and to give new impetus to the efforts towards achieving a world without nuclear weapons. We also welcome the draft resolution's call for negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament,

reaffirming thereby the pivotal role of the Conference as the single permanent multilateral negotiating body.

Mr. Luque (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/68/L.34 and A/C.1/68/L.43.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.34, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations", I recall that the Ecuadorian delegation participated in the tasks of the Open-ended Working Group for the promotion of multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament, and recognizes the contributions made by the Group's deliberations towards achieving the ultimate objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons. Accordingly, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Nevertheless, we reiterate that for Ecuador, until the convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly and until reforms are made to the disarmament machinery, the only negotiating forum for such matters remains the Conference on Disarmament (CD). We therefore recognize those paragraphs in both the preambular and operative sections of the draft resolution that underscore the functions and mandates that the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament gave both to the Conference and to the United Nations Disarmament Commission. At the same time, I note that my country will closely study any initiative that seeks to replace or establish parallel or substitute negotiating mechanisms other than the Conference on Disarmament.

Similarly, my delegation notes with regret, as it did at the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly, that in paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", calling for the launching of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty, there appears to be no need to include a reference to the Conference on Disarmament. This year my delegation asked the authors of the draft resolution, as it did last year, to include a specific reference to the CD. They did not.

I would also recall that in its statement during the thematic debate on the disarmament machinery, the Ecuadorian delegation clearly warned against attempts to repudiate the role that the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament gave to the mandate of the Conference on Disarmament as the only negotiating forum in that domain. We believe

that the current wording of paragraph 9 again fails to recognize the role of the Conference on Disarmament. That paragraph could have also stated that the negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty should also include future production and existing stockpiles in order to address the full range of the issue — that is, from the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation perspectives — which would be in the interests of all.

Moreover, and speaking from a broader perspective on the same draft resolution, my delegation believes that the significance and relevance of a multilateral, legally binding instrument on negative security assurances are critical. While we believe that Security Council resolution 984 (1995) — which is referenced in the draft resolution — represented a positive step in that direction, it cannot replace a legally binding, multilateral instrument. My delegation therefore believes that the draft resolution could have placed greater emphasis on the relevance of negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States as they continue to await such assurances until the nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons have been achieved, for example, through a convention on nuclear weapons — an issue that has also been omitted from the draft resolution.

As has been stated on numerous occasions in the Committee's debates, Ecuador's Constitution prohibits the use and development of weapons of mass destruction and has maintained a staunch policy calling for general and complete disarmament. Accordingly, we would have preferred that the resolution — like resolutions previously adopted or pending adoption by the Committee — include a clear reference supporting the notion of establishing an international, legally binding instrument aimed at prohibiting the development, use or possession of nuclear weapons, wherever and by whomsoever.

While we recognize the positive elements in support of nuclear disarmament contained in the draft resolution, we believe that it could have been better balanced by addressing all aspects of nuclear disarmament. My delegation therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. Neto (Brazil): I am taking the floor to explain the vote of the Brazilian delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/68/L.34 and A/C.1/68/L.43.

The Brazilian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.34, entitled "Taking forward

multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations". We welcome the discussions undertaken within the framework of the open-ended working group established by General Assembly resolution 67/56, which were held in an open, constructive, transparent and interactive manner. We appreciate in particular the valuable contribution made by civil society.

Nonetheless, it must be stressed that our support for the work of the Open-ended Working group is based on the understanding that it represents a useful step towards a comprehensive and effective negotiation process in the Conference on Disarmament (CD). As such, we see the Working Group as a path that leads to the CD, which is the single multilateral body for negotiations on disarmament. In that regard, we appreciate the fact that the draft resolution reaffirms the absolute validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, as well as the role of the CD as set out in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2).

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.43, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", my delegation abstained in the voting. While the Brazilian delegation shares with the sponsors the ultimate goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, we believe that the text would greatly benefit from adjustments reflecting the resolve to pursue the objective in more assertive and unequivocal terms, thereby helping to overcome the current status quo in the field of nuclear disarmament.

It is our view that the text fails to adequately take stock of the compliance deficit that continues to exist with regard to nuclear-weapon States implementing their obligations under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). On the contrary, reiterative language welcoming the recent actions of nuclear-weapon States would suggest that effective, concrete steps are being taken in the field of nuclear disarmament, while we are well aware that this is not the case. We also view with concern language that seems to invoke preconditions for the promotion of nuclear disarmament, such as the enhancement of international peace and security. For Brazil, it is precisely the irreversible and verifiable dismantling of nuclear weapons that would provide for the elimination of one of the greatest sources of mistrust and instability.

With respect to operative paragraph 8, we believe that an explicit mention should have been made of the

annex 2 States whose ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty is required in order for the Treaty to enter into force. On operative paragraph 9, we regret that no reference is made to the need for a fissile material cut-off treaty, serving both disarmament and non-proliferation objectives, which could be done only by dealing with the existing stocks of fissile material. On operative paragraph 12, in line with action 7 of the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT, we believe that it should have expressed 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 on the matter.

Finally, as to operative paragraph 17, on which my delegation also abstained in the voting, we would like to recall that the additional protocol is an instrument of a voluntary nature observed between the International Atomic Energy Agency and its member States. The language used in paragraph 17 would have benefited from the relevant passages of the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference, which noted, *inter alia*, 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.

Mr. Tilegen (Kazakhstan): I would like to present my delegation's explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.34. This year, my delegation voted in favour of that document on the understanding that the Open-ended Working group will not serve as an independent platform parallel to the Conference on Disarmament and the United Nations Disarmament Commission, that its outcomes should be presented to both those multilaterally agreed and established entities of the disarmament machinery, within which all official actions and decisions will be taken.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation would like to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1. The Russian Federation is an unwavering advocate of the idea of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and welcomes initiatives aimed at achieving that noble goal. Furthermore, Russia is working resolutely to put the idea of nuclear disarmament into practice. We have already taken unprecedented steps on the path towards

nuclear disarmament, having reduced our nuclear arsenal tenfold to the low levels of the mid-twentieth century. In that context, we have of course the greatest possible respect for the efforts of the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement in the search for new options to make further progress on the path towards nuclear disarmament.

At the same time, in moving towards nuclear disarmament, it is especially important to bear in mind the realities of today's world and to clearly honour international agreements. Any side-stepping is fraught with the risk of undermining mutual trust and prospects for dialogue on nuclear disarmament, not to mention the lack of concrete steps in that very sensitive field.

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1 focuses on the obligations of nuclear-weapon States pursuant to article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). It is important not to focus on individual sentences but on the full text of article VI, which clearly stipulates that "[e]ach of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations ... on general and complete disarmament". I note that it speaks of general and complete disarmament, and not specifically of nuclear disarmament. That is entirely clear and logical, since nuclear disarmament can occur only within the context of comprehensive and general disarmament, taking into account all factors of strategic stability and international security, in strict compliance with the principle of individual and indivisible security for all.

We cannot agree to citing individual provisions of the NPT out of context. If we opt for one-sided interpretations of the NPT, in essence we will go down the path of destroying it. We must not undermine the NPT. The NPT is the only international agreement that provides for gradual progress towards nuclear disarmament. We understand the concern of the members of the Non-Aligned Movement that the hope for nuclear disarmament alone is not enough, but if we undermine the NPT then any hope for nuclear disarmament itself, not to mention for new practical steps in that field, will be dashed. For the same reasons, we cannot endorse the concept of convening an international high-level conference on nuclear disarmament and setting up yet another symbolic date for the full elimination of nuclear weapons.

The majority of us present here today have actively participated for decades in the complex NPT review process. All of us can see that, even with our solid

experience of concerted efforts, it is sometimes very difficult to find solutions to remaining problems. The launch of a parallel process is but an illusion of progress. In reality, it would undermine existing agreements and postpone to an undetermined date the resolution of all of the most serious and pressing issues. In other words, it could be confined indefinitely to oblivion. It is most important that the new initiatives we come up with promote the consolidation of our joint efforts and not undermine existing achievements.

We therefore propose joining our efforts to implement existing consensus decisions on bolstering the NPT. I refer above all to the plan of action adopted at the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT. We must focus on the substance by creating the conditions necessary for gradual progress towards our end goal of a world free of nuclear weapons. Regardless of the lofty words spoken here and the elegant initiatives that have been taken, real progress towards a world free of nuclear weapons will be impossible unless all the necessary conditions are in place. Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.6/Rev.1 ignores the reality in which we live. The Russian Federation was thus forced to vote against it.

Mr. Shaul (Israel): Israel voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.29/Rev.1 because of the importance it attaches to the objectives of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) presented in the text. However, Israel cannot support and has strong reservations regarding some of the language included in the sixth preambular paragraph and paragraph 1.

It is Israel's long-standing belief that the CTBT and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) are not linked. Any attempt to artificially force such a linkage, especially through a reference to the Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT, which Israel is not a member of, would only jeopardize the CTBT and its noble cause, as well as any prospects for better regional security in the Middle East.

Israel's signature of the CTBT in 1996 reflected its long-standing policy to bring itself closer, wherever possible, to international norms of nuclear safety, security and non-proliferation. Since the establishment of the Preparatory Commission for the CTBT, Israel has actively participated in the development of all elements of the CTBT verification regime. Israel also transmits data from its certified seismic stations to the International Data Centre and actively participates

in various activities related to on-site inspection. I am pleased to announce that Israel's radionuclide laboratory, supporting the International Monitoring System, was recently certified. This substantive and intensive involvement demonstrates the importance Israel attributes to the CTBT and its contribution to the enhancement of international peace and security.

Israel appreciates the significant progress made in the development of the CTBT verification regime, whose completion is a prerequisite to the entry into force of the treaty. However, completion of the verification regime still requires further efforts. Major steps are still needed for the continued build-up and testing of the International Monitoring System stations, the completion of the on-site inspections operational manual, as well as equipment purchase and training. In that regard, we commend the Executive Secretary and the Provisional Technical Secretariat of the CTBT for the continuing work and preparations for the integrated field exercise in 2014, to be hosted by Jordan.

For Israel, the regional security situation in the Middle East, including adherence to and compliance with the Treaty by States of the region, is a major consideration for ratification. It is Israel's view that the Treaty verification regime should be robust enough to detect non-compliance with its basic obligations, be immune to abuse, and at the same time allow each signatory State to protect its national security interests. For Israel, the completion of the verification regime constitutes a major consideration for ratification, as we would like to ensure that there is adequate coverage of the Middle East by the international monitoring system.

In addition, Israel's status in the policymaking organs of the Treaty, including those connected to the geographical region of the Middle East and South Asia, and the Executive Council of the future Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, must be addressed. Sovereign equality, which is a cornerstone of multilateralism, must be ensured.

As in previous years, Israel voted in favour of the draft resolution. Our voting patterns arises from and reflects the importance we attach to the objectives of the CTBT. It is our hope that these will be realized faithfully and in a forthcoming manner. Our full statement will be submitted to the Secretariat.

Mr. Pinheiro da Silva (Portugal): I am taking the floor to explain Portugal's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.34, entitled "Taking forward multilateral

nuclear disarmament negotiations". In regard to resolution A/C.1/68/L. 34, Portugal believes that its text — while generally deserving our support, in particular with regard to the inclusiveness and the constructive work of the Open-ended Working Group — should also have included a reference to the need to enlarge the membership of the Conference on Disarmament. That is why we proposed the addition in the fourth preambular paragraph of the following language: "While supporting a continued expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament". Unfortunately, our proposal was not subject to appropriate consideration. That is why Portugal decided to abstain this year in the voting on resolution A/C.1/68/L.34.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting.

The Committee will now turn to cluster 3, "Outer space (disarmament aspects)", as contained in informal paper 3.

We will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.40, entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities."

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.40 was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 18th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.40 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.4. In addition, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly?

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.40 was adopted.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I now call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who wishes to speak in explanation of position following the adoption of the draft resolution.

Mr. Seifi Pargou (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation regarding the draft resolution entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities", contained in document A/C.1/68/L.40.

The Islamic Republic of Iran strongly believes that outer space is the common heritage of humankind. Outer space shall be explored and used for the benefit and in the interests of all countries, and for present and future generations. Any State, irrespective of its degree of economic or scientific development, has an inalienable right to the exploration and use of outer space, exclusively for peaceful purposes. Accordingly, outer space must be free for exploration and use for peaceful purposes by all States, without discrimination of any kind and on the basis of equality. Likewise, all countries shall have free access to all areas of outer space.

My delegation fully supports the main thrust of the draft resolution, which is focused on the exploration and uses of outer space by all States exclusively for peaceful purposes and the promotion of confidence-building measures to that effect. In line with this principled position, and as in previous years, my delegation joined the consensus in adopting the draft resolution. However, I would like to put on record our understanding in regard to some of the new paragraphs incorporated into the current version of the draft resolution.

First, the eighth preambular paragraph refers to the policy of some States "in not being the first State to place weapons in outer space". According to the relevant international treaties, States parties have already undertaken not to place in orbit around the Earth any object carrying nuclear weapons or any other kind of weapon of mass destruction, install such weapons on celestial bodies or station such weapons in outer space in any other manner. Similarly, the establishment of military bases, installations and fortifications, the testing of any type of weapon and the conduct of military manoeuvres on celestial bodies are forbidden. Therefore, the policy of not being the first State to place weapons in outer space shall be pursued by the States parties to such treaties only as a complementary measure and without prejudice to their legal obligations under relevant treaties.

To be clear, our understanding is that the States party to the relevant treaties, in addition to their already undertaken legal obligations not to place any kind of weapon of mass destruction in outer space, have decided, unilaterally and voluntarily, not to be the first State placing any other kind of weapon in outer space.

Secondly, concerning paragraph 2, regarding encouraging Member States to review and implement the proposed transparency and confidence-building

measures contained in the report of the relevant Group of Governmental Experts (see A/68/189), we have the same view — that such measures should be carried out in full conformity with legal obligations under the relevant international treaties.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): We shall now turn to cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”.

(*spoke in English*)

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.28, entitled “Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.28 was introduced by the representative of the Philippines at the 21st meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.28. The sponsor has informed the Committee of the withdrawal of the revision in operative paragraph 7, as posted on the QuickFirst web portal.

With your permission, Sir, I would like to make the following statement on financial implications, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Under paragraphs 12 and 13 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the assistance necessary and to provide such services as may be required for annual conferences and expert meetings of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention and of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II and Protocol V, as well as for any continuation of the work after the meetings. The Assembly would also request the Secretary-General, in his capacity as depositary of the Convention and the Protocols thereto, to continue to inform the General Assembly periodically, by electronic means, of ratifications and acceptances of and accessions to the Convention, its amended article 1 and the Protocols.

The Secretary-General wishes to draw the attention of Member States to the fact that the respective cost estimates for servicing the three conferences of the High Contracting Parties, to be held from 11 to 15 November 2013, have been prepared by the Secretariat and approved by the Fourteenth Annual Conference of the

High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, held in Geneva on 14 November 2012, the Sixth Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol V, held in Geneva on 12 and 13 November 2012, and the Meeting of High Contracting Parties to the Convention held in Geneva on 15 and 16 November 2012.

The Secretary-General also wishes to draw Member States' attention to the fact that the costs of the Fifteenth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, the Seventh Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol V, and the 2013 Meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention would be borne by the States party and not party to the Convention participating in the meetings, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment, adjusted appropriately.

The request that the Secretary-General render the necessary assistance and provide services to the Fifteenth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, the Seventh Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol V and the 2013 Meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention should thus have no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations. Following the established practice, the Secretariat will prepare cost estimates for any continuation of work after the Conferences for the approval of the High Contracting Parties. It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties that under the respective agreements ought to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.28 would not give rise to any programme budget implications.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.28 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly?

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.28 was adopted.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I give the floor to the representative of Germany, who wishes to speak in explanation of position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Winkler (Germany): I am referring to resolution A/C.1/68/L.28, entitled “Convention on Prohibitions

or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects". Germany has joined the consensus on the resolution. I would like, however, to explain our position, particularly with regard to paragraph 7.

Germany regrets that the final report of the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, held in Geneva in November 2012, did not make any recommendation or decision regarding the continuation of discussions

on mines other than anti-personnel mines, and would therefore have preferred that that view be included in paragraph 7 of the resolution. The irresponsible use of moving target attack missiles poses a humanitarian threat. Universalizing initiatives to limit the operational life span and ensure the detectability of moving target attack missiles are essential to protecting civilians from harm.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): We have thus concluded our consideration of the items on our agenda.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.