



General Assembly

Seventy-first session

First Committee

25th meeting

Tuesday, 1 November 2016, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Boukadoum (Algeria)

The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m.

Agenda items 89 to 105 (continued)

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

The Chair: We shall begin by hearing the remaining delegations that requested the floor to make general statements on cluster 5, “Other disarmament measures and international security”, but did not have the opportunity to speak by the time we adjourned yesterday. Delegations are reminded that general statements are limited to five minutes.

Mr. Verstedden (Netherlands): I have the honour to make the following general statement on the topic of women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control on behalf of Austria, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and my own country, the Netherlands.

We attach great value to draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.37, on women, disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation, and we would like express our gratitude to Trinidad and Tobago for its efforts. Looking around this room today, it is safe to say that this discussion is still very relevant and necessary. In that light, we would like to offer the following remarks.

First, the key role that women play in all United Nations peace and security efforts was reaffirmed in Security Council resolution 1325 (2000), on women and peace and security. In paragraph 1 of that resolution, we are reminded that the increased representation of women is needed at all decision-making levels in national, regional and international institutions and mechanisms for the prevention of conflicts. Disarmament is an integral part of conflict prevention. We further welcome the 2015 review of the implementation of Security Council resolutions 1325 (2000) and 2242 (2015), which, for the first time, specifically encourages empowering women in efforts related to the prevention, combating and eradication of the illicit transfer and the destabilizing accumulation and misuse of small arms and light weapons.

Secondly, on 1 January, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), to which all States Members of the United Nations are committed, officially came into force. We believe that those goals can serve as a reinforcement of our efforts to increase the role of women in the field of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. All goals, and in particular SDG 5, stress that general equality and women’s empowerment are crucial to a peaceful, prosperous and sustainable world. Moreover, SDG 16 explicitly links the promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies to sustainable development. Disarmament plays a role in achieving that because, among other things, that goal commits us to reducing illicit arms flows by 2030.

Thirdly, we welcome the adoption and entry into force of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and encourage

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



States that have not yet done so to accede to it. The ATT obliges States parties making arms expert assessments to take into account the risk of such arms being used to commit or facilitate serious acts of gender-based violence or serious acts of violence against women and children. Therefore, the ATT is highly relevant for the content of that resolution and should be appropriately referred to.

Once again, let me emphasize our strong support for the role of women and the gender perspective in disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control, and we would like to underline the importance of the inclusion of clear references to Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) and SDGs 5 and 16, as well as the Arms Trade Treaty and future resolutions on this topic.

The Chair: I call on the representative of Germany to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.52.

Mr. Anton (Germany): I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution entitled “Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures”, on behalf of the 59 countries listed in document A/C.1/71/L.52.

The draft resolution emphasizes in particular the importance of practical disarmament measures aimed at addressing the illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons, including, inter alia, through weapons collection, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes and enhancing physical security and stockpile-management practices, as well as relevant training programmes, with a view to promoting and implementing an integrated comprehensive and effective weapons-management strategy that would contribute to a sustainable peacebuilding process.

Mrs. Sánchez Rodríguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation would like to make a general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.17, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

Cuba shares the concern outlined in draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.17 with regard to the use of technologies and telecommunications for purposes that are incompatible with international stability and security. International law, and in particular the Charter of the United Nations, is key to the maintenance of peace and stability and to fostering an environment that is open, safe, stable,

accessible and peaceful in the sphere of information and communication technology.

The Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, established this year, has major responsibilities. Among other things, we hope that rules and regulations are recommended to put an end to the covert and illegal use by individuals, organizations and States of the information technology systems of other countries for the purpose of attacking third States. The use of telecommunications for hostile purposes with the overt or covert intention of undermining the legal and political systems of States is a violation of internationally recognized norms in that regard and has an adverse effect on international peace and security.

Once again, the Cuban delegation is compelled to denounce the fact that the Government of the United States continues its radio and television broadcasts in Cuba, in breach of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the provisions of the International Telecommunication Union. The interventionist illegal radio and television broadcasts in Cuba falsify and distort information in order to destabilize and undermine, affect the normal functioning of national radiocommunication service and result in harmful interference to the service of various Cuban radio and television stations. Cuba hopes that the new context of bilateral relations between the two States, starting with the re-establishment of diplomatic relations and the decision to initiate a process to normalize relations, will put an end to those aggressive policies.

Mr. Ammar (Pakistan): I have requested the floor to deliver two general statements. I shall now deliver the first.

Pakistan attaches great importance to the topic “Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control”, which is the title of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.37. We thank the sponsor of the draft resolution, Trinidad and Tobago, for its efforts in presenting the draft. We support the assertion in the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution that the equal, full and effective participation of both men and women is essential for the attainment of sustainable peace and security, as well as that in the ninth preambular paragraph that the role of women in disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control

should be further developed, including through their participation and representation in policymaking, planning and implementation processes related to disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control.

I would also like to inform the Committee that, during its presidency of the Conference on Disarmament, Pakistan had the proud privilege to convene a special session on women in disarmament. This is an extremely important issue for Pakistan. A number of Pakistani women ambassadors hold positions where they address issues of security and disarmament. We therefore consider it important that this matter continue to be discussed at the United Nations. This draft resolution would contribute to enhancing the full focus on that issue.

I will now turn to our general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.17, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”. Information and communications technologies (ICTs) present immense opportunities across a wide range of areas, but, as with other technologies, they pose several challenges, especially when they are used in malicious ways. These developments could entail profound risks for international, regional and national security. The hostile use of cyberspace is growing, and the threat spectrum is getting increasingly complex.

We therefore note with satisfaction that the Groups of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security have made a useful contribution not only to raising awareness not only of the challenges, but also to evolving a common understanding of potential risks. But important work remains to be done in evolving agreed legal principles, norms, confidence-building measures and the cross-cutting issues of international assistance and cooperation.

Pakistan is pleased to be a sponsor of the draft resolution. We thank the penholder of the draft resolution for its efforts. However, we express our disappointment with the fact that Pakistan was not included in the Group of Governmental Experts that was established last year, pursuant to the adoption of resolution 70/237. Four groups of governmental experts have concluded their work in that area, while the fifth is in progress. It is now high time that the work being done in the smaller setting of the Group of Governmental

Experts be brought to a broader multilateral setting and representative forum such as the Conference on Disarmament or the General Assembly.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to make a general statement on the issue of international information security.

I think everybody will support me in saying that our overall common challenge is to prevent conflict in the information sector and ensure the security and stability of the international information sphere. We hope that the unanimity with which increasing numbers of States support that endeavour will determine the future thrust of international discussions on issues related to ensuring international information security, in particular within the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security.

Once again, I would like to express our deep gratitude to all the States sponsoring the Russian draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.17. The establishment of a solid group of responsible States as sponsors of the draft resolution clearly reflects the international community’s understanding of the issue of international information security, as well as the readiness of those States to continue actively discussing that issue here within the United Nations. Despite the fact that for some narrow politicized reasons one capital took the sudden decision to ask that the draft resolution be put to a vote, we nonetheless expect that we will have a consensus-based approval of this document, which is exceptionally important to strengthening international security. Everything is now in the hands of member States.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico to introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/71/L.39 and A/C.1/71/L.40.

Mrs. García Guiza (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.39, entitled “United Nations Disarmament Information Programme”. The draft resolution recommends, among other things, that the Programme continue reporting, educating and raising public awareness of the importance of multilateral measures in the area of arms control and disarmament.

My delegation also wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.40, entitled “Disarmament and non-proliferation education”. That draft highlights the importance of education for disarmament and

non-proliferation, especially among young people, not only with regard to the issue of weapons of mass destruction, but also to small arms and light weapons, terrorism and other obstacles to international security and the disarmament process.

The Chair: I now call on delegations wishing to explain their vote or position before we take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 5, “Other disarmament measures and international security”. Statements are limited to ten minutes.

Ms. Bila (Ukraine): I would like to make some important remarks regarding the position of Ukraine on the Russian draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.17, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

Ukraine has always demonstrated its broad support for that text, previously adopted by consensus within the framework of the First Committee. But everything changed for my country in 2014, right after the initiator of the draft resolution, the Russian Federation, illegally annexed Crimea and started military aggression in eastern Ukraine. Today, we decided to break the consensus around this draft resolution. For the very first time since the document appeared at the United Nations in 1998, Ukraine will abstain in the voting. I would like to express our position on the present subject.

Ukraine strongly supports the concerns outlined in resolution 70/237 with regard to the use of information and communications technology (ICT) for purposes that are incompatible with ensuring international peace and security. The initiator of the draft resolution, Russia, by its continued actions has demonstrated that ICT can be used by State actors for the purpose of bringing instability, war, horror and conflict to the region. Furthermore, ICT today has become one of the strongest elements of the so-called hybrid war — a new type of war operation that Russia invented and tested on Ukraine and could probably test somewhere else in the future.

My country expresses its deep concern regarding the active use of foreign computer systems by some States, including the Russian Federation, in order to perform targeted cyberattacks, interventions and hacking of objects of critical State infrastructure that could lead to social crises and military conflicts in the region. Ukraine is a strong supporter of the idea that ICT should be used only as a tool for development,

according to provisions and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Transparent and inclusive international dialogue based on the principles of openness could stop and prevent the current active use of ICT as a method of fuelling conflicts and hostility.

Considering the Russian aggression, and based on its own experience, Ukraine is convinced that safe cyberspace and the existence of a reliable mechanism of international containment and counteraction against cyberattacks organized by State and non-State actors have a crucial role in ensuring peace, stability and security at the regional and global levels. The Ukrainian delegation calls on all member States to implement already existing provisions of international law in the sphere of the proper usage of ICT for peaceful purposes. My country supports the idea of creating a United Nations-based so-called rapid reaction and reconversion team, an international entity that could quickly react and neutralize cyberattacks at the global or regional level, and we are ready to become part of it.

To conclude, I would like to mention that Ukraine fully supports the sense and the spirit of the most recent report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security (A/71/174), and welcomes the increasing interaction of Member States in the field of very sensitive information security issues.

Finally, we consider the actions of the Russian Federation foolish and insolent. It is creating artificial military conflicts in neighbouring countries and annexing the sovereign territory of foreign States through the use of ICT and military power, and therefore has no right to represent itself here as a standard bearer for the concept of a safe and secure global information space. The Russian Federation is currently waging a powerful information war against Ukraine, making cyberattacks on Ukrainian energy facilities and spreading lies and propaganda via ICT, actions that are all completely contrary to the provisions of the draft resolution that it is introducing today. Under the current conditions, we consider this draft resolution to be a phony attempt by the Russian Federation to mask its true role in actively attempting to make the international information space unsafe and dangerous. My delegation therefore requests a recorded vote.

Mr. Buffin (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): My delegation would like to make the following statement

on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.63 on the effects of the use of armaments and ammunition containing depleted uranium.

Belgium will vote in favour of that text. On 11 May 2007, Belgium adopted a law prohibiting mini-ammunition and armour containing depleted uranium or any other type of industrial uranium in general. The law entered into force in 2009. Belgium became the first country in the world to ban such weapons by relying on precaution and prudence. It appears that it is impossible to guarantee that the use of ammunition containing depleted ammunition poses no threat to human health or the environment, as emerged during parliamentary hearings that took place before the law was adopted.

On that occasion, scientists expressed differing opinions. Legislators concluded that the precautionary principle should prevail. Belgium pays very close attention to all developments in scientific analysis of the threats posed by the use of weapons systems containing depleted uranium, including international studies on the subject. Belgium remains willing to provide the United Nations and its Member States with any information pertaining to defining the goals and modalities of the Belgium law adopted on 11 May 2007. Belgium hopes that the draft resolution that we will adopt in the First Committee can lead to a better understanding at the international level of the likely undesirable, pernicious side effects of the use of ammunition containing depleted uranium, with a view to ultimately reaching a shared conclusion.

Mr. Sano (Japan): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain Japan's position on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.63, entitled, "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunition containing depleted uranium".

Japan will vote in favour of the draft resolution. In accordance with resolution 69/57, adopted in 2014, Japan has submitted its views on the effects related to the use of depleted uranium armaments and ammunition to the United Nations and its Member States. As we have communicated to the Secretary-General, Japan has neither used nor possessed armaments and ammunition that contain depleted uranium. We recognize that despite the studies conducted by the relevant international organizations on the effects of the use of that type of munition on human health and the environment, at present no internationally definitive conclusion has been drawn. Japan will continue to

follow developments in the study conducted by the relevant international organizations.

In that connection, Japan would like to call on all relevant international organizations to conduct successive on-site studies and further information-gathering, including the latest scientific findings. At the same time, we ask that those organizations pay due attention to the opinions and activities of the non-governmental organizations interested in this field and provide their views on the effects that the use of munitions containing depleted uranium can or might have on the human body, as well as the environment.

Mr. Pollard (United Kingdom): I take the floor on behalf of France and my own country, the United Kingdom, to explain our position before the adoption of draft resolutions A/C.1/71/L.44, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", and A/C.1/71/L.46, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development".

On A/C.1/71/L.44, France and the United Kingdom will join consensus on this draft resolution. While doing so, we wish to make clear that France and the United Kingdom operate under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms-control and disarmament agreements. As stated in this draft resolution, we see no direct connection between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control. Moreover, we regret that this text has not been updated so as to take into account major recent multilateral developments with regard to environmental issues. In particular, it is unfortunate that no mention is made of the Paris Agreement on Climate Change and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which was adopted in Paris on 12 December 2015 and signed in New York on 22 April this year.

On draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.46, France and the United Kingdom will again join consensus on this text. We support the mainstreaming of disarmament issues and development policy, particularly in the field of conventional weapons; small arms and light weapons; and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. That said, we feel it necessary to make our position clear on other aspects of that text.

The notion of a symbiotic relationship between disarmament and development appears questionable

to us, as the conditions conducive to disarmament are not necessarily dependent on development only, as evidenced in the growing military expenditure of some developing countries. There is no automatic link between the two, but rather a complex relationship that this notion does not adequately capture. Moreover, the idea that military expenditure directly diverts funding from development requirements would need to be nuanced, as defence investments are also necessary to developing peacekeeping, improving responses to natural disasters in airborne and maritime equipment and, under certain conditions, favouring stability.

Finally, we consider that the reports of the Group of Governmental Experts do not give sufficient credit to unilateral, bilateral and multilateral actions in disarmament and non-proliferation.

Mrs. Sánchez Rodríguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.52/Rev.1, entitled “Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures”.

It is impossible to develop a general, integrated, effective and balanced strategy for arms control and disarmament if that strategy focuses exclusively on one category of weapons and ignores the importance of weapons of mass destruction, such as nuclear weapons and sophisticated conventional weapons. No paragraph of the draft resolution should be interpreted as offering a specific formal mandate under the General Assembly to the group of States interested in concrete disarmament measures. That group must continue to function in an entirely informal and unofficial capacity and can in no way interfere, duplicate or replace the intergovernmental deliberations and negotiations that take place in the context of the United Nations.

In paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, more neutral language should have been used. It should have been limited to noting the work of interested States. The Cuban delegation considers that the language of that paragraph does not necessarily imply our country’s endorsement of each and every activity undertaken by that group. As for paragraph 6, States Members of the United Nations must discuss, negotiate and make decisions only on whether it is convenient to establish specific voluntary national or regional indicators to measure progress in reaching Sustainable Development Goal 16.4 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. We believe the reference, in paragraph 8,

to the financial contributions to the Arms Trade Treaty fiduciary fund is unnecessary. Finally, in the context of the fifth preambular paragraph, my delegation wishes to place on the record that the reference to Security Council resolution 2171 (2014) is without prejudice to our national position on that resolution — including its contents regarding the doctrine of the responsibility to protect, on which the position of Cuba is well known.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 5, “Other disarmament measures and international security”.

We will first take action on A/C.1/71/L.17, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

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

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.17 was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the Committee’s 19th meeting, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.17. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-Delegate portal of the First Committee. The additional sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.17 is the Niger.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, 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 Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, 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, 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:

None

Abstaining:

Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.17 was adopted by 177 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.37, entitled "Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.37 was introduced by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago at the Committee's 19th meeting, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.37.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on the tenth preambular paragraph of A/C.1/71/L.37.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malawi, Nicaragua,

Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zimbabwe

The tenth preambular paragraph was retained by 146 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.37 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.37 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.39, entitled “United Nations Disarmament Information Programme”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.39 was introduced by the representative of Mexico. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.39.

The additional sponsors are listed in the e-Delegate portal of the First Committee. The additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.39 are Equatorial Guinea and Nigeria.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.39 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.39 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.40, entitled “Disarmament and non-proliferation education”.

I have been informed of a technical correction to the title of the draft resolution. The words, “United Nations study on” shall be added to the title. It now reads, “United Nations study on disarmament and non-proliferation education”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.40 was introduced by the

representative of Mexico. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.40.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.40 have expressed the wish that it be adopted, as technically corrected, by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.40, as technically corrected, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.44, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.44 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the Committee’s 19th meeting, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.44.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.44 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.44 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.45, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.45 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the Committee’s 19th meeting, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.45.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.45 was adopted by 124 votes to 3, with 50 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.46, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.46 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the Committee's 19th meeting, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.46.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.46 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.46 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.51, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.51 was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.51.

The additional sponsors are listed in the e-Delegate portal of the First Committee. The additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.51 are Equatorial Guinea and the Niger.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.51 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.51 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.52/Rev.1, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.52/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Germany at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.52/Rev.1.

The additional sponsors are listed in the e-Delegate portal of the First Committee. The additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.52/Rev.1 are Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea and Greece.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.52/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.52/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/71/L.54, entitled "Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/71/L.54 was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 19th meeting, on 24 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/71/L.54.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft decision A/C.1/71/L.54 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/71/L.54 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.63, entitled "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.63 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The

sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.63.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.63 was adopted by 146 votes to 4, with 26 abstentions.

The Chair: I now call on those representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Riquet (France) (*spoke in French*): I am speaking on behalf of the United Kingdom, the United States and my own country to explain our vote against draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.63, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”.

This is not a new issue. The environmental and long-term health effects of the use of depleted uranium munitions have been thoroughly investigated by the World Health Organization, the United Nations Environment Programme, the International Atomic Energy Agency, NATO, the United States Centers for Disease Control, the European Commission and others. None of these inquiries has documented long-term environmental or health effects attributable to the use of these munitions. It is therefore regrettable that the conclusions of these studies have been ignored and that the authors are calling for further studies without taking into account the existing research.

It is further regrettable that the sponsors of this draft resolution have failed to quote the response from 2010 from the United Nations Environment Programme in its entirety and only retained a partial quotation in an attempt to strengthen their alleged claim. This quote reads as follows:

“The main scientific findings were consistent across the three assessments. Measurements taken at the depleted uranium sites showed that, even in areas with widespread depleted uranium contamination, the overall levels of radioactivity were low and within acceptable standards, with no immediate dangers from either particle-based or waterborne toxicity.” (*A/65/129/Add.1, III, para. 4*)

Given the lack of tangible evidence to the contrary, we do not recognize the presupposed potential risk to health and the environment and therefore cannot support United Nations resolutions that presuppose depleted uranium is harmful.

Mr. Verstedden (Netherlands): I am speaking on behalf of Norway and my own country, the Netherlands.

We have once again voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.63, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”. However, we regret that the draft resolution tends to accept the conclusion on the health effects of depleted uranium, although scientific research is ongoing and as of yet inconclusive. The relevant United Nations Environment Programme report of 2010 is cited in a selective way in the draft resolution. In its report to the Secretary-General on the subject, the United Nations Environmental Programme stated that,

“[m]easurements taken at the depleted uranium sites showed that, even in areas with widespread depleted uranium contamination, the overall levels of radioactivity were low and within acceptable international standards, with no immediate dangers from either particle-based or waterborne toxicity” (*A/65/129/Add.1, III, para. 4*).

Furthermore, we feel that key words in the draft resolution should have been formulated in a more neutral way. Instead of using the terms “potential long-term effects” or “potential hazards” or “potential harmful effects”, the more neutral term “possible consequences” would have been preferable. The reference in the draft resolution to the potential harmful effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium on human health and the environment cannot be supported by conclusive scientific evidence, a view that is shared by the World Health Organization and the International Atomic Energy Agency in the report of the Secretary-General.

Nevertheless, since scientific uncertainties regarding the possible consequences of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium persist, and taking into account the aforementioned explanation of our vote, we support the call for a precautionary approach to the use of depleted uranium. We will closely monitor the outcome of ongoing and future research in this field and take any further developments into consideration when this

issue is taken up again during the 2018 session of the First Committee.

Mr. Anton (Germany): I would like to explain our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.63, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”.

Germany continues to regret that the results of the 2010 report of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (A/65/129/Add.1) continue to be quoted in a selective and misleading way. The aforementioned UNEP report also stated that the measured overall levels of radioactivity were low and within acceptable international standards with no immediate danger from either particle-based or waterborne toxicity. New results and especially those from the most recent report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic radiation submitted to the current session of the First Committee have not been properly taken into account. The report states,

“[n]o clinically significant pathologies related from exposure from depleted uranium were found in military personnel or members of the public. This is consistent with expectations, given the low levels of measured or assessed exposures” (A/71/46, para. 62).

In 2012 and 2014, Germany gave explanations of vote on the inadequate reflection of the content of the United Nations Environment Programme study. Unfortunately, no corrections have been made since then. Germany holds the view that the effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium should be studied further. We will continue to very closely follow the scientific discussions and results on that topic. Thus, the text of this year’s draft resolution, regrettably, does not allow us to support it.

Mr. Masmajan (Switzerland): I am taking the floor on behalf of Sweden and my own country, Switzerland, to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.63, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”.

Our countries voted in favour of the draft resolution. We are concerned with the persisting uncertainties regarding the long-term environmental impact of depleted uranium, in particular with respect to potential groundwater contamination. We also understand the concerns of affected communities, as stressed in the

draft resolution’s eleventh preambular paragraph, and believe that they should be appropriately addressed.

However, our countries would like to note that the relevant United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) report of 2010, which was financially and technically supported by our countries, is quoted in a selective way in the draft resolution. The UNEP report clearly states that:

“[e]ven in areas with widespread depleted uranium contamination, the overall levels of radioactivity were low and within acceptable international standards with no immediate dangers from either particle-based or waterborne toxicity” (A/65/129/Add.1, III, para. 4).

Our countries further note that the potential harmful effects of the use of depleted uranium munitions on human health and the environment, mentioned in the draft resolution, are not substantiated by conclusive scientific evidence. Our countries have supported relevant research in that field, and we would have preferred a more balanced reflection of that body of research. We therefore support further research in that area and appreciate further discussion on that issue in appropriate forums both within and beyond the United Nations. We also support the call for appropriate precautionary measures. Raising awareness in affected communities should also be among the measures to be taken.

Ms. Gambhir (India): I wish to explain India’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.37, entitled “Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control”. India voted in favour of A/C.1/71/L.37, as it fully supports the objectives it seeks to promote. We were, however, forced to abstain in the voting on the tenth preambular paragraph, which contains a reference to the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT).

As explained with reference to draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, India is conducting an internal review in its position and, pending its conclusion, abstained in the voting on that draft resolution. We therefore believe that any reference in this draft resolution to the ATT applies only to and among State parties to the Treaty.

Mrs. Sánchez Rodríguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.37, entitled “Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control”.

Our delegation supported the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus, as we share its primary purposes. We must continue to adopt measures to ensure the full participation of women in decision-making at all levels in order to create policies that promote international peace and security, both in national and international institutions. The General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council should enforce the agreed international obligations on that topic.

Nevertheless, we note the importance of maintaining a balanced draft resolution that avoids stressing specific arms categories such as small arms and light weapons, which can be seen in the sixth and eleventh preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 4, 7 and 9, to the detriment of others, including weapons of mass destruction and sophisticated conventional weapons.

With regard to the tenth preambular paragraph, we believe that the mention of only one specific treaty is not in keeping with the nature of what is meant to be a general resolution and constitutes an imbalance. Other relevant instruments are not mentioned, which could lead to a misinterpretation — that other treaties are less important. The Arms Trade Treaty, the only treaty mentioned in the draft resolution, does not enjoy the consensus of the Member States. Cuba will continue to support and promote practical actions aimed at achieving gender equality and women's empowerment. We will also maintain open communication with the main authors of this important draft resolution, with a view to contributing in any way possible to its improvement over the coming years.

Ms. Chand (Fiji): I take the floor on behalf of Fiji to explain Fiji's vote on the tenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.37, entitled "Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control".

Fiji abstained in the voting regarding that paragraph earlier today, and while we acknowledge the spirit and resolve of the draft resolution in its entirety, we simply could not vote in favour of the tenth preambular paragraph, due to the reference to the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). Fiji is not a party to the Treaty, and it would therefore be premature to commit to any obligation that it cannot undertake in good faith at this stage. Fiji will continue to abstain and adopt such a position on any draft resolution that references or borrows language from the ATT until such a time when it is able to do otherwise, after having exhausted parliamentary processes. Nevertheless, we note the

heightened importance of the draft resolution and the centrality of the role that should be played by women, negotiations and measures pertaining to disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. It is in recognition of that important role that we encourage States to continue supporting the spirit of the draft resolution, in its entirety, as a whole.

Mr. Hall (United States of America): I have asked for the floor to offer an explanation of position on two draft resolutions in cluster 5, A/C.1/71/L.44 and A/C.1/71/L.46.

The United States did not participate in the action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.44, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control". The United States operates under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms-control and disarmament agreements. We see no direct connection, as stated in that draft resolution, between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control, and do not consider that matter to be germane to the First Committee.

The United States also did not participate in the Committee's action on A/C.1/71/L.46, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". My Government believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues. Accordingly, we do not consider ourselves bound by the final document of the international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development, which was adopted on 11 September 1987.

Mr. Toro-Carnevali (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My country voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.37, but abstained in the voting on the tenth preambular paragraph.

Venezuela abstained in the voting on the Arms Trade Treaty in the General Assembly and maintains that position. We were unable to support the paragraphs referring to the implementation or adoption of that international instrument.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation joined the consensus in adopting draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.37, entitled "Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control". However, we would like to place on record that the draft resolution is acceptable to my delegation inasmuch as

it is in line with our Constitution, laws, regulations and administrative procedures. We would also like to place on record that we dissociate ourselves from consensus on the tenth preambular paragraph of A/C.1/71/L.37 and operative paragraph 8 of A/C.1/71/L.52/Rev.1, which contain references to the Arms Trade Treaty.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the vote on cluster 5, “Other disarmament measures in international security.”

The Committee will now turn to cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security”.

I now give the floor to delegations wishing to explain their position before we take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 6.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation will not participate in the action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.30, entitled “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”, given the continued crisis in the occupied Palestine territories and the imposition by the Israeli regime of the severest blockade, including from the Mediterranean part, on the people of Gaza. The draft resolution does not factually reflect the situation in the occupied territory and therefore is far from reflecting the actual reality in the region.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions under cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security”.

We will first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.14, entitled “Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context.”

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.14 was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee’s 20th meeting, on 25 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.14.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.14 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.15, entitled “Regional disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.15 was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee’s 20th meeting, on 25 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.15.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution 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.1/71/L.15 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.16, entitled “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.16 was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee’s 20th meeting, on 25 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.16.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. Separate recorded votes have been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote first.

The Committee will now vote on the sixth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo,

Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, 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, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, 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, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Russian Federation

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 164 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei

Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bhutan, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 133 votes to 1, with 34 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.16 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, 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, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, 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:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.16, as a whole, was adopted by 176 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.30, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.30 was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the 20th meeting of the First Committee, on 25 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.30.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.30 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/71/L.69, entitled "Maintenance of international security — good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/71/L.69 was submitted by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia on 24 October. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/71/L.69.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/71/L.69 was adopted.

The Chair: I now call on delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Ms. Gambhir (India): I wish to explain India's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.16, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

India voted against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/71/L.16 and its paragraph 2, which requests the Conference on Disarmament to consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control. The Conference, as a single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has a vocation of negotiating disarmament instruments of global application. In 1993, the United Nations Disarmament Commission had by consensus adopted guidelines and recommendations for regional disarmament. There is no need therefore for the Conference on Disarmament to engage itself in formulating principles on the same subject at a time when it has several other priority issues on its agenda.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now turn to cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”.

First I shall give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions under cluster 7. Delegations are reminded that general statements are limited to five minutes.

Mrs. Sánchez Rodríguez (Cuba) (spoke in Spanish): The current United Nations disarmament machinery, established by the consensus of all Member States, is indispensable. Each one of its components performs a fundamental role that must be preserved. We advocate convening as soon as possible the fourth special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, which could contribute to the revitalization and strengthening of the disarmament machinery.

The lack of specific results in the area of disarmament is due not to the working methods or the rules of procedure of the bodies of the current machinery, but rather to the lack of political will on the part of certain States. In the past, the Conference on Disarmament has demonstrated its capacity to negotiate and adopt treaties. We regret the fact that it has not been able to conduct substantive work for nearly two decades.

The Conference on Disarmament must adopt with further delay a broad, balanced programme of work, taking into account the real priorities in the

area of disarmament, beginning with the initiation of negotiations on a comprehensive convention on nuclear disarmament. The relevance of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body is unquestionable. Even when agreements are not reached on given recommendations, the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission are always useful and necessary. The lack of progress in the disarmament machinery cannot be used as a pretext to ignore or marginalize it.

We are opposed to negotiations undertaken by ad hoc groups of countries or other mechanisms outside the disarmament machinery, which are characterized by a lack of inclusivity and transparency. We are also concerned about the proliferation of groups of governmental experts confined to just 20 or 25 countries that draft resolutions for the First Committee to consider on issues of great importance to international peace and security. Very often, the recommendations agreed in those limited groups are automatically endorsed in draft resolutions, without the majority of States having the opportunity to evaluate them in depth. Paradoxically, a major part of the United Nations budget allocated to disarmament is allocated to such groups. The formation of groups of governmental experts should be the exception and not the rule. Instead, there should be transparent and inclusive processes within the bodies of the United Nations disarmament machinery, wherein all Member States can participate in equal conditions.

Lastly, we wish to stress, within the framework of the thirtieth anniversary of their creation, the positive role played by the United Nations Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament. However, the roles of the Centres remains far from meeting their full potential. We are concerned about their complete dependence on voluntary financial contributions to develop their projects. The United Nations regular budget should guarantee the minimum resources necessary to remedy the situation, which threatens the necessary independence of the Centres with respect to the interests of donor countries.

Mr. Isnomo (Indonesia): The Open-ended Working Group on the fourth special session of General Assembly devoted to Disarmament met for two sessions this year with the active and positive participation of many delegations, including those that abstained in the voting on decision 70/551, which convened it, and will meet for a further third and final session in June 2017. In order for the Working Group to present its report, it has been procedurally necessary to introduce draft

decision A/C.1/71/L.66, whereby the General Assembly would include in the agenda of the seventy-second session a sub-item entitled “Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”. It is our hope that that draft decision can be adopted without a vote or with a unanimous vote so as not to give the wrong impression that Member States are prejudging the outcome of the Open-ended Working Group, which, at the same time, would be premature.

The Chair: The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”.

The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.6, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.6 was introduced by the representative of the Republic of Korea at the 22nd meeting of the Committee, on 27 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/71/L.6.

I have the honour to read the present oral statement in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.6, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to ensure and to strengthen, if needed, the provision to the Conference on Disarmament of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services. It is recalled that resources for the substantive and Secretariat support of the Conference on Disarmament are included under section 4, “Disarmament” and that the resources for conference servicing are included under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and conference management” of the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

Subject to decisions taken at the 2017 session of the Conference on Disarmament to establish its programme of work for 2017 and to establish any subsidiary body for its implementation, the strengthening of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services to the Conference, as requested in operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, may entail additional resource requirements under the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017. The established procedures

on the preparation of a statement of programme budget implications would be followed, as necessary, in the context of actions to be taken by the Conference on Disarmament. Accordingly, at this time, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.6 would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.6 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.27, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.27 was introduced by the representative of Nepal at the 22nd meeting of the Committee, on 27 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.27. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-Delegate portal of the First Committee. The additional sponsor is Samoa.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.27 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.38, entitled “Report of the Disarmament Commission”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.38 was introduced by the representative of Vanuatu at the 19th meeting of the Committee, on 24 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/71/L.38.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.38 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.38 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.50, “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.50 was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 19 October, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.50.

I have the honour to read the present oral statement in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 11 and 12 of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.50, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to facilitate close cooperation between the Regional Centre and the African Union, in particular in the areas of disarmament, peace and security, and also request the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Regional Centre with the support necessary for greater achievements and results. The implementation of the request contained in paragraph 11 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

Regarding paragraph 12, provisions under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017, cover one P-5 post, one P-3 post and two General Service local-level posts, as well as general operating expenses. The programme of activities of the Regional Centre would also continue to be financed from extra-budgetary resources. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.50, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.50 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.60, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.60 was introduced by the representative of Peru, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, at the 20th meeting of the Committee, on 25 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.60.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.60 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.62, entitled “United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.62 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the 21st meeting of the Committee, on 26 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/71/L.62.

I have the honour to read the present oral statement in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.62, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide all support necessary, within existing resources, to the regional centres in carrying out their programmes of activities. The implementation of the request contained in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017. The provisions contained therein cover the three P-5

Director posts; the three P-3 political affairs officer posts; and four General Service local-level posts, as well as general operating costs of the centres. The programme of activities of the three regional centres would also continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.62, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section 6 of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the most recent of which is resolution 70/247, of 23 December 2015, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

I would now like to draw the attention of delegations to the additional sponsors listed in the e-Delegate portal of the First Committee.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.62 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/71/L.66, entitled "Open-ended Working Group on the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/71/L.66 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the 21st meeting of the Committee, on 26 October. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/71/L.66.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, 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, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Draft decision A/C.1/71/L.66 was adopted by 175 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.67, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms, Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.67 was introduced by the representative of the Central African Republic, on behalf of the Economic Community of Central African States, at the 20th meeting of the Committee, on 25 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/71/L.67.

The Chair: The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that the draft resolution 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.1/71/L.67 was adopted.

The Chair: I now call on delegations wishing to make statements in explanations of vote after the voting.

Mr. Riquet (France) (*spoke in French*): I take the floor on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom and my own country, France, to explain our delegations’ abstentions in the voting on draft decision A/C.1/71/L.66, entitled, “Open-ended Working Group on the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”.

Draft decision A/C.1/71/L.66 was based on the provisions of resolution 65/66, on which our delegations abstained for budgetary and substantive reasons. We will continue to raise concerns about the merit of convening a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD-IV). We would like to voice our concerns about the fact that new rhetoric was introduced in last year’s decision when it was submitted to the General Assembly after its adoption in the First Committee. Under no circumstances should that become a precedent in future deliberations.

We would also like to recall that resolution 65/66 stipulates that the Open-ended Working Group on the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament must conduct its work on the

basis of consensus. We have paid close attention to the discussions being held on the subject during the Working Group’s sessions organized in 2016, and we will continue to do so during the final session in June 2017. We would like to stress that all future work on the SSOD-IV must remain consensus-based and that SSOD-IV itself must also be based on consensus, in line with the precedent set at the first, second and third special sessions. It is for those reasons that our delegation decided to maintain its abstention.

The Chair: The Committee will now turn to cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”.

I now give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions under cluster 1. Delegations are reminded that general statements are limited to five minutes.

Mr. Bessedik (Algeria) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation is delivering this statement on behalf of the Group of Arab States with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”, which was submitted earlier by the Group of Arab States.

In recent decades, the Arab Group has submitted this rather traditional draft resolution, to the extent that it has become part and parcel of the literature of the First Committee. However, it remains of vital importance. We need to establish the Middle East as a zone free of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, which is the fourth tenet of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

Since the 1980s, the General Assembly has adopted a number of resolutions on this issue. The NPT was extended on the basis of the 1995 decision on the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. Unfortunately, however, all of those efforts remain a dead letter. The 2010 NPT Review Conference set out a realistic plan of action that would lead to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. However, that decision has not yet been operationalized.

We recall that we believed that 2012 would see proceedings initiated to convene a regional conference in Helsinki. However, one party out of all the relevant parties surprised the international community by resorting to an illegal and arbitrary decision, whereby the conference was postponed *sine die*. The holding of the 2015 NPT Review Conference did not remedy the

situation, and the final documents of that meeting did not achieve the required consensus.

The international community has felt a sense of frustration over such depressing developments. We have sought to implement our collective strategy to establish the Middle East as a zone free of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction. That was an ideal upheld by Arab leaders and the Committee of Wise Men. We believe that procrastination in fulfilling that target is a threat to international peace and security.

We reiterate once again that the international community and stakeholders should uphold their international commitments on the basis of the 1995 resolution relating to the Middle East. That resolution is still valid until its goals and objectives are fully implemented. In the meantime, we strongly hope that the Arab decision made earlier this year will lead us to establish a new Middle East that is free of all nuclear, chemical and biological threats. We must finally establish that necessary zone.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the observer of the European Union.

Ms. Kemppainen (European Union): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU). Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Norway, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia align themselves with this statement.

With regard to the Middle East and the cluster on nuclear weapons, I would like to make the following observations.

The European Union reaffirms its strong commitment to the establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems in the Middle East. We reiterate our support for the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the goals and objectives adopted by the 2000 and the 2010 Review Conferences. We consider the 1995 resolution to be valid until its goals and objectives are achieved.

We deeply regret that the Conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems has not been convened. We maintain the view that dialogue and building confidence among all stakeholders is the only sustainable way to agree arrangements for a meaningful

conference to be attended by all States of the Middle East on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at by them, as decided by the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT.

The European Union has continuously expressed its readiness to assist in the process leading to the establishment of a zone in the Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction. In order to help to produce a conducive atmosphere and move the process forward, the European Union organized seminars in 2011 and 2012, as well as a capacity-building workshop in 2014 for Middle Eastern diplomats in support of a Helsinki conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems.

We continue to call on all States of the region that have not yet done so to accede to the NPT, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological Weapons Convention to sign and ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and to conclude a comprehensive safeguards agreement, additional protocols and, as applicable, a modified small-quantities protocol with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

The EU condemns in the strongest terms the confirmed use of chemical weapons by the Syrian Arab Armed Forces and Da'esh. The findings reflected in the reports of the Joint Implementation Mechanism require strong action by the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and the Security Council. All those responsible must be held accountable.

The EU facilitated the diplomatic efforts of the E3+3 countries and Iran to find a negotiated solution to the Iranian nuclear issue. Those efforts culminated last year in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, which was concluded in full conformity with the principles of the NPT. The High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy will continue to play a key role in coordinating the work of the Joint Commission, which is tasked with overseeing the implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

In that context, it is important for Iran to implement the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, fully cooperate with the IAEA and ratify the additional protocols to its Safeguards Agreement. These are essential prerequisites for the IAEA to be able to provide the international community with the necessary assurances aiming at ensuring the exclusively peaceful nature of

Iran's nuclear programme. The full and sustained implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and Security Council resolution 2231 (2015), which endorses it, should contribute positively to regional and international peace and security.

It has been more than five years since the IAEA Board of Governors reported Syria's non-compliance with its Safeguards Agreement to the Security Council and the General Assembly. We deeply regret that Syria has yet to remedy its non-compliance. The EU calls on Syria to fully cooperate with the IAEA to resolve all outstanding issues and to swiftly conclude, bring into force and implement in full the Additional Protocol.

The Chair: I now call on delegations wishing to explain their vote or position before we take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 1.

Ms. Rahamimoff-Honig (Israel): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", which Israel will vote against, has been submitted once again by the Group of Arab States. This is an unfortunate annual attempt to divert the First Committee's attention from the real proliferation challenges facing the Middle East. This approach serves neither the interests of regional States nor those of the international community.

Although the text of the draft resolution has been altered from previous years' language, the change introduced by its authors is by no means an attempt to reconcile differences pertaining to it; quite the contrary. Not only does the draft resolution distort the truth, it also fails to genuinely address the weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) risks in the region. This should worry us all, as the draft resolution undermines any attempt to address regional threats effectively and curtails chances for a real and constructive dialogue among regional States.

The authors of the draft resolution neglect to mention that four regional countries — namely, Iran, Iraq, Syria and Libya, some of which are sponsors of the draft resolution — violated their obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and promoted a clandestine military nuclear programme in contravention of their international obligations. They also overlooked Iran's continued aspirations to acquire nuclear weapons and its continuous development of ballistic missiles. In that regard, it is important to recall that since January of this year Iran has tested 10 ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads.

These were of various ranges, including a missile with a range of 2,500 kilometres that extends well beyond the Middle East. During the month of March, Iran tested a missile inscribed with a direct threat to annihilate the State of Israel.

In his July report (S/2016/589) on the implementation of Security Council resolution 2231 (2015), the Secretary-General called on Iran to refrain from conducting these missile tests, warning that they have the potential to increase tensions in the region. He also clearly stipulated that Iran's missile tests are not consistent with the spirit of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Taken together with Iran's subversive activity in the region, as well as its support in training, weapons and financial means of terrorist organizations in the region, it is clear that the drafters of the draft resolution have misdirected their efforts.

The drafters of the draft resolution would have our attention turned away also from the continuous use by the Syrian regime of chemical weapons, as was clearly reported by the Joint Investigative Mechanism in its 24 August and 28 October reports. The findings of the Mechanism indicate a persistent and worrying pattern of use of chemical weapons against the Syrian population, even after Syria's accession to the Chemical Weapons Convention and its assumption of the obligation to forgo such capabilities and the use of chemical weapons.

This is especially significant in the light of the remaining discrepancies, inconsistencies and gaps in the Syrian declarations to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, and the growing concerns about residual chemical-weapons capability, including research and development, which would allow Syria to rehabilitate its chemical-weapon programme. The draft resolution would have us also forget about the proliferation of chemical weapons to terrorist organizations and cases of the use of such weapons.

It is also unfortunate that the authors of the draft resolution have not deemed worthy of mention the five rounds of direct regional consultations, with the facilitation of former Finnish Under-Secretary of State Jaakko Laajava, in 2013 and 2014. During these consultations, Israel and its neighbours engaged on the necessary elements to convene a conference on regional security and a Middle East that would be free from wars, hostilities and WMDs, including delivery means. While these rounds of consultations indicated

that a conceptual gap remains between the regional parties, they were nevertheless an important start to a necessary dialogue. Israel, for its part, clearly indicated its willingness to proceed with these endeavours. It was unfortunate that the Arab Group has preferred to express regret and concern over the non-convening of the 2012 Helsinki Conference in this and other draft resolutions, rather than engage in the sustained efforts required to achieve consensus on these consultations and bring them to fruition.

The draft resolution is detached from reality and from what the peoples of the Middle East have been experiencing: unrest and growing instability, unrelenting violence, large-scale displacement of population and territories ceded or abandoned to terrorists. The threat of the proliferation of WMDs cannot be ignored or misrepresented, as the text of the draft resolution purports to do.

We reject the draft resolution in its entirety and call upon members of this body to vote against it. Such a vote would send an essential message to its authors that direct regional engagement and forthcoming attempts to build consensus on the broad range of security issues affecting the Middle East are the only way to advance this important issue. Attempts to sidetrack, detour or shortcut by submitting one-sided and biased draft resolutions in the multilateral sphere will not succeed. If regional States wish to truly address the real risks and challenges in the region, they need to start by adopting a mature and forthcoming approach that promotes direct dialogue, the building of confidence and trust.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): My delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”. As we have reported to the Committee in past years, we cannot support this resolution because we simply do not believe that it will advance the important goal of a Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction and delivery systems.

Meaningful progress towards a regional zone will require the engagement and constructive participation of all concerned States on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at — let me repeat, on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at. Singling out one State for criticism while ignoring the substantial security concerns and compliance challenges that remain in the region is not a realistic manner of advancing this goal. Politically motivated draft resolutions will only

move the regional States farther apart and undermine the trust and confidence necessary to resuming such a dialogue.

The United States continues to strongly support universal adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the goal of a Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction and delivery systems. We have been clear that this worthy goal is enormously ambitious but achievable, once essential conditions are in place. We remain committed to working with the United Kingdom and the Russian Federation to advance the intermediate goal of convening a conference on the establishment of a weapons of mass destruction-free zone in the Middle East. Getting there requires resumed, inclusive discussions between the regional States on mutually acceptable arrangements. The United States stands ready to actively support such discussions.

We encourage all regional States, including the sponsors of the draft resolution, to actively pursue renewed regional dialogue on these issues so that real progress can be made towards a Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”.

The Committee will first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Egypt, on behalf of the Group of Arab States, at the Committee’s 12th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. Separate recorded votes have been requested on the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs. I shall put those paragraphs to the vote first, one by one, starting with the fifth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia,

Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, 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, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, 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 Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Pakistan

The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 165 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, 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 Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Pakistan

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 147 votes to 6, with 21 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.34/Rev.1 was submitted by the representative of Mexico on 14 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.34/Rev.1. The additional sponsor, Grenada, is listed in the e-Delegate portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.34/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.34/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: I now call on delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Masmajeán (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): This year, Switzerland has once again voted in favour of the draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East" (A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1). The draft resolution promotes the universalization of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in the Middle East region. Switzerland fully subscribes to that goal.

Switzerland regrets that the concrete measures adopted by the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT with respect to the creation of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction could not be adopted as planned, and that the process appears now to have reached a stalemate. The establishment of such a zone is essential.

Switzerland has firmly supported all efforts to that end and is prepared to support any practical process towards the realization of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Switzerland's support will be in full accordance with the framework of the outcome document of the eighth NPT Review Conference.

With respect to provisions set out in the draft resolution, Switzerland notes that in the operative paragraphs, reference is made only to one nuclear proliferation threat in the Middle East and singles out only one country of the region. By voting in favour of the draft resolution, Switzerland wishes to demonstrate the importance it gives to full respect of the obligations under the NPT by all States members of the region that are party to that instrument.

Mr. Ri In-Chul (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", as we express strong support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. We would like to underline the importance of taking confidence-building measures in order to enhance peace and security in the region.

While we support the main objective of the draft resolution, my delegation dissociates itself from the reference to a general call for universal adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, as that does not conform to our position.

In addition, in the same cluster, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea voted against draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.28, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", due to its unchanging position of total rejection of the Security Council resolutions against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as having no regularity, morality or fairness, the product of the Council's high-handed arbitrariness and double standards.

The Council remains silent about the aggressive and provocative nuclear-war exercises in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that take place in South Korea every year. The United States/South Korea joint military exercises pose the greatest threat to peace on the Korean peninsula and the world, but when the Democratic People's Republic of Korea conducted nuclear tests and ballistic rocket launch tests as self-defence measures, the five permanent members of the Security Council called them a threat to international

peace and stability. The permanent five have conducted 99 per cent of all nuclear tests.

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 Democratic People's Republic of Korea delegation is of the different view that more attention should be given to taking practical steps towards nuclear disarmament, which is at the top of the Non-Aligned Movement's disarmament agenda.

Ms. Gambhir (India): I wish to explain India's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

India abstained in the voting on A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1 as a whole and voted against its fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs, as we believe that the focus of the draft resolution should be limited to the region that it intends to address. India's position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is well known. The 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which codified the prevailing customary international law, provides that States are bound by a treaty based on the principle of free consent. The call on those States remaining outside the NPT to accede to it and accept the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards on all their nuclear activities is at variance with that principle and does not reflect current realities. India is not party to the NPT and is not bound by its outcome documents. That also applies to certain operative paragraphs of A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1.

Mr. Ammar (Pakistan): I have taken the floor to explain my delegation's position on the draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", contained in document A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1.

Pakistan continues to support the primary purpose and focus of the draft resolution and therefore voted in its favour this year. However, we believe that references to the recommendations and conclusions emanating from various review conferences of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as reflected in the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution, need to be qualified. Pakistan is not party to the NPT and therefore is not bound by any of its conclusions or recommendations.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation voted in favour of draft

resolution A/C.1/71/L.2/Rev.1, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”. Our support is based on our belief in the importance of this issue to peace in our region and the world at large, and reflects our true belief in the need to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

In earlier statements, we have referred to the fact that Syria was one of the first countries to call for the establishment of a Middle East free of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, as reflected in our adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 1969. To that lofty end, in 2003 my country submitted a proposal to the Security Council to rid the zone of all nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction. We called on the General Assembly to monitor the implementation of that initiative, with the participation of all actors with a stake in demilitarization.

Israel has introduced an ironic scenario akin to a tragicomedy, whereby the threats posed by its conventional weapons distract our attention from its nuclear capabilities. It seeks to distract us from the fact that Israel has not adhered to the NPT or subjected its nuclear facilities to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. There is a worldwide consensus about the unique threat in the Middle East posed by Israel’s possession and potential use of nuclear weapons in many regions, as well as its possession of biological weapons. Some have sought to engage in Byzantine dialogue in an effort to distract our attention from suspect activities in a non-objective approach. It is rather ironic that the representative of Israel should provocatively throw stones at other people’s houses while its own is made of glass. Israel remains adamant in its rejection of the raft of resolutions adopted by the relevant organizations.

We are truly disappointed to see the undeclared alliance between Israel and the European Union, casting doubt on my country’s cooperation with the IAEA. This constitutes an untimely provocation, distracting us from Israel’s rejection of its obligations in the Middle East. The representatives of the European Union are not in a position to give lessons or criticize other people. We must remind them that there are numerous members of the European Union in a situation of non-compliance regarding the NPT. They have nuclear weapons based on their territories, in addition to their direct, indirect, declared and undeclared cooperation with Israel by supplying that country with nuclear, biological and

chemical technologies and other materials useful in the dissemination and proliferation of those weapons. We have tried to honour our obligations under the NPT. We have concluded comprehensive safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency and are ready to receive its inspectors to monitor our activities.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to those delegations who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I remind them that the first intervention in exercise of the right of reply is limited to 10 minutes and the second to five.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I am sure it will be a surprise to everyone that I would like to thank the representative of the current Ukrainian regime for her statement in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.17, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

Today we have all once again seen the true face of the current Kyiv regime, staffed by those who came to power in February 2014 as a result of an armed anti-constitutional coup d’état that was largely prepared and fully supported by the United States and the European Union. We have often heard a completely different perspective in the propaganda spouted by our Western colleagues in espousing so-called democratic values. However, we can all see the ultranationalist bent of the Kyiv regime, which has elevated Second World War military criminals to the status of heroes.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my compassion and sympathy to our brothers of Ukraine, with whom we have a rich, centuries-old relationship. Essentially, we have been, are and will be one family. It is very telling that the Ukrainian people’s support for the ultranationalist regime in Kyiv, even according to Western assessments, is virtually non-existent. That is clear. No normal person with common sense who supports the values of a democratic State can support the ultranationalists in Kyiv who elevate to the rank of heroes military criminals of the Second World War who were condemned by the Nuremberg Tribunal.

We will never forget the crimes committed during the Second World War, which claimed more than 60 million lives in the Soviet Union and China. It is interesting that the democratic international community is currently commemorating the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Nuremberg Tribunal and

recalling the final sentences handed down to the criminals of Nazi Germany, including those whom the current authorities in Kyiv have put on a pedestal.

Regarding information security, I would advise all Western capitals that consider themselves to be champions of democratic values to open their eyes, abandon their amnesia and thoroughly assess what is actually happening in Ukraine. As a result of the coup d'état, which had Western support, the most dubious, pro-fascist, ultranationalist forces have come to power in Kyiv in a bloody civil war. Those who opposed it were destroyed and killed by the Kyiv authorities. Let us think about that. The entire population of south-eastern Ukraine, amounting to 5 million people, have been declared terrorists and attacked by the Kyiv authorities, which have deployed regular troops against civilians, using heavy artillery, cluster bombs, fire bombs, heavy gunfire and air strikes, and focusing on destroying civilian facilities in Donbas, including hospitals, schools, retirement homes and kindergartens.

Today, in the heart of Europe, in the twenty-first century, a terrible genocide is being unleashed on the people of south-eastern Ukraine. According to various data, including from Western sources, between approximately 5,000 and 10,000 civilians in south-eastern Ukraine have been killed by the Kyiv authorities. What is this Russian aggression that the Ukrainian ultranationalist regime and its patrons in Washington, D.C., keep talking about? Anyone with common sense can understand why the inhabitants of south-eastern Ukraine took up arms when their homes were invaded by the ultranationalists sent by the Kyiv authorities. Old people and children were attacked. Women were raped. Of course those people took up arms to protect themselves. We must not forget that the people of Donbas are able to protect themselves because they are the children and grandchildren of the same courageous people who stood up to the same pro-fascist forces that entered Ukraine after Hitler's acts of aggression in 1941.

With regard to information security, I would like to ask a question of the Committee. In the past three years, have members seen anything like the information I have provided in the so-called free, democratic mass-media outlets of the West? Most likely they will answer for themselves that it has been quite difficult to find such information in the Western media. Furthermore, thanks to the efforts of the leaders of Germany, France and Russia, in February 2015 large-scale hostilities were

halted in Donbas. The Minsk agreements were drawn up to settle the intragovernmental crisis in Ukraine.

It is very important to understand that the current President of Ukraine, Petro Poroshenko, who came to power through the coup d'état, signed the Minsk agreements. Once again, I draw attention to the facts in the context of information security. Anyone can consult the Minsk agreements. I always have them to hand and know them by heart. The key part is the requirement that the Kyiv regime cease hostilities in the south-eastern part of the country, offer amnesty and a full exchange of prisoners, undergo constitutional reform, sit down for negotiations and allow those who live in the south-eastern part of the country to determine their own social, economic and political future for themselves — and I emphasize — within Ukraine. The Kyiv authorities have failed to uphold any of those requirements. I am sure that the representative of the Kyiv regime to the First Committee has been given instructions to state the direct opposite. However, anyone can easily see that that would be a lie.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): I am taking the floor to exercise my right of reply to respond to several things that were said by my colleague from the Russian Federation.

First and foremost, let us not forget that Russia continues to violate Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity. I think that that is a very important point that we should not let go here. What the representative of the Russian Federation said with regard to Nazis and fascists running the Ukrainian Government is, I believe, absurd. As I am sure that my colleague from the Russian Federation knows, there were parliamentary elections in Ukraine, and the parties that Russia continues to label as fascists fell far short of the 5 per cent threshold needed to enter the Parliament. To make that kind of broad accusation against the Ukrainian Government is, to say the least, quite unfair and frankly farcical.

I do not know what more can be said about the charges that have been made, but I believe that it is important that the international community continue to put pressure on the Russian Federation until it fulfils its commitments under the Minsk agreements and returns the Crimean peninsula to Ukraine.

Ms. Bila (Ukraine): Now all of the representatives here know what Russian propaganda sounds like — a great many words that convey nothing. That propaganda campaign is being conducted against a backdrop of the

crimes committed against Ukraine by Putin's regime. Those crimes have been reported by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, which has a special monitoring mission in my country. Ten minutes of the First Committee's time have been stolen by the lies of the representative of the Russian Federation. Everyone knows that they are lies, and I am very sorry that we have all had to waste time listening to traditional Russian propaganda. Now members can imagine what it feels like for the people who hear such strange things every day through various media, such as telecommunications, among others. Perhaps, during the next session when we vote on a draft resolution on developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security, the First Committee will consider the dangerous propaganda promoted by that criminal State.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I have listened to my American colleague's very interesting comments and would once again like to draw the Committee's attention to his words. He said that Russia is not upholding the Minsk agreements. I would like to ask everyone to consult them. The text of the agreements does not make a single reference to any commitments that Russia has to uphold, and that document was signed by the Presidents of France and Germany and the current President of Ukraine. There is nothing in the text that Russia has to uphold. Once again, in the interests of ensuring information security — or Russian propaganda, if you like — members can open the document and see for themselves.

My second point is that much has been said about Russia violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine. Ukrainian sovereignty was violated by the unconstitutional military coup d'état supported by the United States of America and the countries of the European Union. The country has essentially ceased

to exist. The fact that the people of Crimea held a referendum and decided to live independently and separately from Ukraine was their right as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. A referendum was conducted throughout Crimea. Some 97 per cent of the people living in Crimea voted, and 95 per cent of them voted to separate from Ukraine. No shots were fired. Not a single person died. That is a true example of democracy. Incidentally, we have all been schooled in that area by our Western partners. What are they saying now? They are saying that they support a Kyiv regime that is waging a war against its own people.

And what about the claim that Russia is behaving aggressively? I would advise all the members of the Committee to take a good long look at the documents that emerged from a recent meeting of the Valdai International Discussion Club attended by political scientists from all over the world, including the United States, France and Germany. For four hours they questioned the President of the Russian Federation directly about all their concerns, none of which resembled those that have been raised here by my so-called colleagues from Ukraine or by the representative of the United States. I would like to ask everyone not to forget why we are gathered here. Our collective aim is to facilitate the search for solutions to problems of international security. Let us do that.

There is no statute of limitations on military crimes, including those perpetrated by the current Kyiv regime, and we should all prepare for a new Nuremberg trial for the people who have attempted to bring back to life the heinous crimes of Nazi Germany and those participating in them. Incidentally, it was Ukrainian nationalists who were responsible for the deaths of 200,000 Polish civilians in the so-called Volhynia massacre. And now they are being glorified in Kyiv.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.