



General Assembly

Sixty-fifth session

First Committee

19th meeting

Tuesday, 26 October 2010, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Miloš Koterec (Slovakia)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda items 88 to 104 and 162 (continued)

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

The Chair: This afternoon, the First Committee, in accordance with its programme of work and timetable, will begin the third phase of its work, namely, action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under agenda items 88 to 104 and 162.

The Committee will take action on the draft resolutions listed in informal paper 1*, which is being circulated today, starting with those in cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”. After completing action on the draft resolutions in cluster 1, the Committee will proceed to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 2, “Other weapons of mass destruction”, followed by action on the draft resolutions and decisions contained in the remaining clusters.

In proceeding with our work, I would like to remind delegations that the Committee will follow the procedure that I outlined yesterday and that was further explained in an informal paper on the ground rules circulated during our meeting yesterday. I once again appeal to all delegations to observe the procedure and to avoid any interruptions once voting on a cluster begins.

Let me quickly remind delegations again that the sponsors of draft resolutions may make general statements at the beginning of the consideration of the

draft resolutions and decisions under a particular cluster, but they may not make statements in explanation of vote before or after action is taken, in accordance with the rules of procedure.

Even though there is no formal time limit on statements in explanation of vote, I would like to beg members’ indulgence to limit their statements to a reasonable length — let us say a maximum of two minutes — bearing in mind that it is in the interest of us all to finish our work by Friday.

Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing either to make general statements other than explanations of vote on any draft resolution or decision in the cluster or to introduce a draft resolution.

I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.5.

Mr. Tarar (Pakistan): I have the honour to take the floor to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/65/L.5, entitled “Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons”, on behalf of the delegations of Bangladesh, Benin, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Peru, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam and my own delegation.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.



Non-nuclear-weapon States have demanded negative security assurances since the 1960s. The demand crystallized in 1968 during the final phase of the negotiations on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). However, the response of the nuclear-weapon States, reflected in Security Council resolution 255 (1968), was not adequate. At the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, it was agreed to conclude an international instrument to provide binding and credible negative security assurances to the non-nuclear-weapon States. Unfortunately, however, the declarations made by four of the five nuclear-weapon States at that session, and later at the NPT Review and Extension Conference and reflected in Security Council resolution 984 (1995), were also considered to be insufficient, qualified and partial by most non-nuclear-weapon States.

Some justifications for legally binding security assurances are as follows. The proportionality of response required under international humanitarian law in regard to both strategic and conventional armed conflicts means that the right to self-defence is not unfettered. Conditional and non-legally binding security assurances, both positive and negative, are basically political declarations. Such declarations would become inoperative in the case of an attack on the States providing the assurances or their allies mounted by a nuclear-weapon State or in alliance with it. Even States of a nuclear-weapon-free zone do not enjoy ironclad guarantees. Only one nuclear-weapon State has given unconditional negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States and members of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

The indefinite extension of the NPT and the lack of a timeline for nuclear disarmament amount to an arrogation by nuclear-weapon States of the right to retain nuclear weapons indefinitely, while the highest priority of nuclear disarmament remains confined to discussion. Security doctrines envisaging the possible use of nuclear weapons against the use or threat of use of chemical and biological weapons and against terrorism run counter to the letter and spirit of Security Council resolutions 255 (1968) and 984 (1995). Additionally, new security doctrines conjuring up scenarios of winnable nuclear wars against non-nuclear-weapon States are not tenable.

The Non-Aligned Movement has rightly expressed concern over the development of new types of nuclear weapons and their possible deployment. The

development of tactical nuclear weapons for actual use, while eroding the confidence-building effect of negative security assurances, represents a disastrous miscalculation that the use of low-yield nuclear weapons would remain localized and not conflagrate beyond the theatre of conflict.

The expansion of nuclear alliances and provisions for the sharing of nuclear weapons and command and control among alliance members has increased the geographical scope of the use of nuclear weapons. NATO, for example, retains the option to use nuclear weapons as part of its deterrence posture. That is inconsistent with the negative security assurance pledges of its nuclear-weapon States members. The concept of negative security assurances is weakened by the professed right to use overwhelming force, understood to include nuclear weapons and a nuclear response to non-nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

Such factors lend great urgency to the task of concluding legally binding credible negative security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States. The sponsors of the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/65/L.5 seek to underline that sense of urgency and to see it translated into concrete action.

Besides technical updating, in the third preambular paragraph the draft resolution notes that the renewed interest in nuclear disarmament should be translated into concrete actions for the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. While reaffirming the urgent need to reach an early agreement on effective international arrangements for negative security assurances, the draft resolution notes with satisfaction that there is no objection in principle to the idea of an international convention on the subject. It appeals to all States, especially the nuclear-weapon States, to work towards an early agreement and recommends further intensification of efforts to evolve a common approach and a common formula on this issue. Finally, it recommends that the Conference on Disarmament actively continue intensive negotiations with a view to reaching an early agreement on negative security assurances.

The sponsors believe that the conclusion of effective arrangements on negative security assurances would constitute a major confidence-building measure in the current tense international circumstances between the nuclear- and non-nuclear-weapon States, as well as

among the nuclear-weapon States. Secondly, it would contribute to reducing nuclear danger. It would ease the threats that arise from new doctrines of nuclear use, and facilitate the negotiations on other matters relating to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

Accordingly, my delegation and the sponsors urge the adoption of the draft resolution with the highest possible majority.

Ms. Kennedy (United States of America): I would like to note that the United States will not participate in action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.18, entitled "Missiles". I also would like to draw the Committee's attention to developments that can provide useful background, I believe, for our consideration of draft resolutions in this cluster.

Over the past year, the United States has conducted an extensive review of its nuclear posture, including policies regarding nuclear weapons. This review has produced declarations that reduce the role of nuclear weapons in our security policy and point the way towards further reductions in nuclear force levels.

In addition, there has been forward movement on nuclear-weapon-free zones. The United States is preparing to submit protocols to the African and South Pacific nuclear-weapon-free zones to the United States Senate for advice and consent to ratification. Indeed, much greater progress is possible in this area. Secretary of State Clinton recently reiterated our readiness to consult with parties to additional nuclear-weapon-free zones in Central Asia and South-East Asia in an effort to reach agreement that would allow us to sign protocols to these treaties. We hope that our partners will be ready soon to respond to that offer.

This gives us cause for optimism that further progress is indeed possible in extending the benefits of legally binding nuclear-weapon-free zones to additional countries. The successful completion of arrangements regarding these zones will extend a legally binding negative security assurance to States that are members of these zones.

We all understand that more needs to be done to reach the goal of a world without nuclear weapons. It is useful to recall, however, that we have had some good success in this field, such as the New START treaty between the United States and Russia, and there is every possibility that, with hard work and good-faith negotiations, we can and will achieve the final goal.

Ms. Kelly (Ireland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the seven members of the New Agenda Coalition: Brazil, Egypt, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa, Sweden and my own country, Ireland.

I wish to refer to the draft resolution presented by the New Agenda Coalition in document A/C.1/65/L.25, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". The Committee will shortly take action on this draft resolution.

As is well known, the members of the New Agenda Coalition are firmly committed to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in all its aspects. This is clear from the text of our draft resolution, which welcomes in its entirety the adoption by the NPT Review Conference in May 2010 of a substantive Final Document (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)). It also reaffirms that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing processes, and calls on all States to comply fully with all commitments made regarding nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation.

However, as the Committee is well aware, the specific focus and *raison d'être* of the Coalition is nuclear disarmament. We make no apology for this. We believe that the implementation of disarmament commitments has been neglected over many years. As we said in our statement in the general debate (see A/C.1/65/PV.2), it was dissatisfaction with the lack of progress on nuclear disarmament in the aftermath of the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference that led to the establishment of the New Agenda Coalition in Dublin in 1998 and continues to inform our work today. The lack of satisfactory implementation of the practical steps of 2000 and the calling of some of those steps into question was a major disappointment to us, as was the failure of the 2005 Review Conference.

We therefore welcome the adoption by this year's NPT Review Conference of a substantive outcome, with conclusions and recommendations for follow-on actions on all three pillars of the Treaty and on the Middle East.

We believe that the true test of the value of the Review Conference outcome will be the implementation of the commitments undertaken. The draft resolution underlines the importance of early progress and encourages the taking of various steps in this regard.

We believe that early engagement and substantive progress in implementation of the steps agreed at the Review Conference would be an important signal of the seriousness with which nuclear-weapon States view their undertakings and of their commitment to implementing the action plan on nuclear disarmament. Providing information on activities undertaken is an important means of increasing confidence, and we encourage all nuclear-weapon States to do this.

The draft resolution also reiterates our long-held views on issues such as the importance of the NPT and its universalization, as well as the fulfilment of past commitments.

We have consulted with the nuclear-weapon States and with a large number of non-nuclear-weapon States regarding the text of the draft resolution. We have received a great many comments and observations. Several of these have been incorporated into the text of the draft resolution. However, given the group's focus on nuclear disarmament, we were unable to include some proposals that would have expanded the scope of the draft resolution into other areas, or that would have represented a departure from our positions on matters of principle.

We encourage all Member States to support the draft resolution. We hope that, in line with the broader trends in international affairs in the area of nuclear disarmament, the growth that has been seen in recent years in support for our resolution will be continued this year.

Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons", allow me to refer to the importance of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.5, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", which Cuba will once again co-sponsor this year.

Until we have achieved the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, we must have a legally binding international instrument through which nuclear-weapon States would give negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States on the use or threat of use of these weapons. Such security assurances should be universal and unconditional, and the Conference on Disarmament, as the only multilateral forum for negotiations in the area of disarmament, should work to that end as a matter of priority.

In this regard, we reiterate the need for nuclear-weapon States that have signed or ratified any of the relevant protocols of the treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones with reservations or unilateral interpretative declarations that affect the denuclearization of any zone to withdraw those declarations or reservations. Cuba reaffirms the importance of establishing zones that are free of nuclear weapons in different regions around the world as an important contribution by States and a concrete step towards the goal of nuclear disarmament. That is why my delegation will support the draft resolutions on this topic, and in particular the important need for the urgent establishment of such a zone in the Middle East.

A great number of resolutions and decisions have been adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council and other international bodies with the same aim of calling attention to the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. In this context, we reaffirm the need for Israel to accede to the Treaty on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and to submit all of its nuclear weapons to the comprehensive safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency so as to realize the objective of attaining universal adherence to the NPT in the Middle East.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Allow me, on behalf of the Russian Federation and the United States, to introduce the updated draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1, "Bilateral reductions of strategic offensive weapons and the new framework for strategic relations".

In this room on 14 October, jointly with the United States delegation, the Russian Federation introduced the original draft resolution, which was circulated to many delegations and all coordinators of the regional groups. Our delegation conducted intensive consultations with the representatives of regional groups, primarily with the Chair of the Non-Aligned Movement. Following those consultations, the sponsors made a number of amendments to the draft resolution, including to paragraphs 7, 10 and 11. We believe that these amendments will gain broader support for the draft resolution and ideally lead to its adoption by consensus. We also believe that the consultations we

held opened the way for all delegations to express their views regarding the draft.

Once again, we call on States to support this important document, which recognizes the significant achievements in the sphere of nuclear disarmament and, in particular, the conclusion of the New START agreement.

In my national capacity, I would like to address draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.41, on Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status. I would like to inform the Committee that the Russian Federation is ready to co-sponsor the draft resolution. The joint statement of the five nuclear-weapon States is further proof of the willingness of the nuclear-weapon States to respect Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status.

Mr. Bozaganov (Turkmenistan): I take the floor to make a general statement as the focal point on the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia. We would like to bring to the Committee's attention two technical corrections to the English version of paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.10*, entitled "Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia". The word "adoption" should be replaced with the word "submission" in the first line and the word "agreement" should be replaced with the word "treaty" in the third line. We hope that these technical corrections will not pose any problems to delegations and that the draft resolution will be adopted without a vote.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of Mongolia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.41.

Ms. Gankhuurai (Mongolia): As in previous years, my delegation has the honour to present to the First Committee a draft resolution entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status", contained in document A/C.1/65/L.41. My delegation wishes to express its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his report on this subject (A/65/136) and to all Member States that sponsored the draft resolution.

The draft resolution goes back to 1998, when the General Assembly in its resolution 53/77 D welcomed the declaration by Mongolia of its nuclear-weapon-free status. Every second year since then, this Committee has adopted a draft resolution on this item, without a vote.

My delegation shares the revived hope expressed by this Committee that the outcomes achieved in 2010 in the field of disarmament, including the successful 2010 Review Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), will be sustained in the months and years to come, thus lending momentum to further efforts aimed at achieving a world without nuclear weapons. Mongolia's broadly recognized and unique nuclear-weapon-free status, and the important contribution it makes to nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and regional and international peace and security, will be part of these efforts. In going forward, my delegation hopes for the continued cooperation of Member States to consolidate and strengthen this status.

Paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.41 cites paragraph 100 of the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)), in which the Conference welcomed the declaration by Mongolia of its nuclear-weapon-free status, and supports the efforts by Mongolia to consolidate and strengthen this status.

The draft resolution also contains two updates. The ninth preambular paragraph reflects the support expressed for Mongolia's nuclear-weapon free status at the Fifteenth Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries, held in Sharm el-Sheikh in 2009. The eleventh preambular paragraph reflects the support expressed by the second Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia, held in April in New York.

Mongolia attaches great value to dialogue and cooperation with member States on matters concerning our resolution, as well as the support extended by member States for our efforts. My delegation expresses the hope that, as in previous years, the Committee will adopt this draft resolution without a vote.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of Japan to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43.

Mr. Suda (Japan): I will make a statement to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". The draft resolution is sponsored by nearly 90 member States, which I will not mention individually because of time limitations. Japan, together with many other sponsors, has been submitting draft resolutions on nuclear disarmament

since 1994 that have enjoyed the overwhelming support of the Members of the United Nations.

This year, taking into consideration the significant outcome of the 2010 Review Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Japan has submitted a draft resolution with the new title “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”. Most of the new paragraphs reflect the Final Document of the Review Conference (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)).

The draft resolution is more comprehensive than ever and emphasizes the need for all States to take further practical steps and effective measures towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons. It also seeks the broadest possible support from Member States and groups, including nuclear-weapon States. In this regard, it is very encouraging that as many as 88 States are sponsoring the draft resolution.

We have tried to develop the content of the draft resolution every year, and we will continue to do so, while taking into account progress and developments on nuclear disarmament issues and the views of Member States. My delegation believes that support for the draft resolution in its entirety by an overwhelming majority would help to consolidate our recent momentum and energize our united action.

Mr. Danon (France) (*spoke in French*): I am speaking on behalf of the delegations of Morocco and France concerning draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.48 on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).

By participating in the fifth Ministerial Meeting on the CTBT on 23 September, Morocco and France sought to demonstrate once again their commitment to the entry into force as soon as possible of a Treaty that is one of the key elements of the international disarmament and non-proliferation regime. As coordinators of the facilitation of the entry into force of the Treaty, they defined a plan of action in coordination with the Executive Secretary of the Preparatory Committee, and launched a number of initiatives at the international and regional levels to promote that entry into force.

France has always unswervingly supported the CTBT, which it signed after its completion in 1996; with the United Kingdom, it was the first nuclear-weapon State to ratify the Treaty, more than 12 years ago. We gave substance to our commitment through

forceful action; in 1998, we began dismantling our testing centre in the Pacific. France no longer has facilities that would allow it to conduct nuclear tests, and is the only nuclear-weapon State to have made this irreversible gesture.

For its part, the Kingdom of Morocco, which was among the first countries to ratify the Treaty and is contributing to its network of surveillance stations, attaches great importance to the Treaty as a fundamental instrument of the global non-proliferation and disarmament architecture.

Now signed by 182 States and ratified by 153, the CTBT is gathering powerful political momentum. That reality demonstrates the international community’s self-evident concern and commitment to fighting for a definitive end to nuclear testing. Having been open for signature for 14 years, however, the CTBT has yet to enter into force, at a time when the verification system required by the Treaty is almost ready. The nine States that are still in annex 2 should heed the call of the international community and join the rest of us in making the ban on nuclear testing irreversible, transparent and verifiable. We call on all those that have not yet done so to ratify the Treaty as soon as possible.

The Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), held in May, and its successful Final Document (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)) also highlighted the vital importance of the entry into force of the CTBT and its role in strengthening the NPT. We should welcome the practical measures adopted at the Review Conference with a view to implementing the resolution of 1995 on the Middle East. The creation of a zone free of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery is a vital initiative for promoting stability and peace in the Middle East.

We are also particularly encouraged by the positive prospects for ratification by a number of States in annex 2. In his statement in Prague, President Obama stressed that ratification of the CTBT was one of his priorities in the area of disarmament. At the Article XIV Conference in September 2009, the Chinese Foreign Minister stressed that China would continue to work alongside the international community with a view to promoting the Treaty’s entry into force. More recently, Indonesia began the ratification process for the Treaty. We have no doubt that all these new elements will reinforce our actions at

the global level towards the Treaty's entry into force. Morocco and France will continue their efforts to promote accession to the Treaty and urges all friends of the Treaty to work together to facilitate its entry into force as soon as possible.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of Nigeria to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.54.

Mr. Obisakin (Nigeria) (*spoke in French*): I take the floor on behalf of the African Group to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.54, entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty".

(*spoke in English*)

The draft resolution, as we all know, is one of the disarmament building blocks aimed at the eventual total, comprehensive and irreversible elimination of nuclear weapons. I am also pleased to inform the Committee that, on 18 August, Zambia deposited its instrument of ratification of the Treaty of Pelindaba, having ratified it on 28 June. This brings the number of ratifications and deposits to 30, and all African states have now signed the Treaty, which entered into force in July 2009.

There have been only a few, entirely technical amendments to the draft resolution. Last year, the draft resolution was adopted by the First Committee by consensus, and the African Group hopes that its colleagues will do the same today.

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

I shall first give the floor to those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on the draft resolutions within this cluster before the voting.

Mr. Yun Yong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to clarify its position with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.25.

My delegation notes with appreciation the main purposes of the draft resolution, which seeks to achieve the global denuclearization desired by humankind and urges the nuclear-weapon States to implement their nuclear disarmament obligations. Therefore, if the draft resolution had omitted paragraph 13, concerning the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, it would certainly have enjoyed the support of my delegation.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not oppose the Six-Party Talks, including the commitments set forth in the Joint Statement of September 2005, and has no reason whatsoever to delay their implementation. The failure to implement those commitments is due entirely to the fact that the United States and Japan have denied the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's right to use outer space, made an issue of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's satellite launch of April 2009 in the Security Council and imposed sanctions on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

If all parties to the Six-Party Talks are faithful to the Joint Statement of 19 September 2005, which is based on mutual respect and equality, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will certainly go to the Six-Party Talks.

It is the consistent position of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula must be realized through talks and negotiations. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea cannot help but possess nuclear weapons as a self-defence measure to safeguard its sovereignty and its people from the daily increasing nuclear threat of the United States. Therefore, to resolve the Korean nuclear issue, the United States, which caused the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula, should end its nuclear blackmail of, and hostile policy against, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

It is well known that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is discriminatory and selective in its implementation. A typical example of that can be seen in the case of the Korean peninsula. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea acceded to the NPT in 1985 in the expectation that the Treaty would prevent the United States from introducing nuclear weapons into South Korea, remove the nuclear threat of the United States and benefit us in the field of nuclear energy development. None of those expectations were met. By abusing the NPT, the United States blocked the peaceful use of nuclear energy and went so far as to infringe upon the supreme interests of the State. That is the major factor that compelled the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to withdraw from the NPT. Therefore, if our concerns are not completely dispelled, it will not be possible for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to rejoin the NPT and the International Atomic Energy Agency. For

that reason, my delegation proposed a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.25 and will vote against it.

My delegation would like to highlight its position on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.48, submitted to this Committee. Security Council resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009), referred to in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, are typical examples of the irresponsibility, unfairness and double standards of the Council.

Since its inception, the Security Council has never made an issue of the big Power that has conducted the most nuclear tests, possesses the largest nuclear arsenal and has continued vertical and horizontal nuclear proliferation, openly threatening other countries with nuclear weapons. But it has made an issue of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which has taken self-defensive measures to safeguard its sovereignty against the nuclear threat by that big Power.

Thus, the Security Council has already lost its credibility. However, it is the consistent position of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to realize the denuclearization of the world, including the Korean peninsula. Therefore, my delegation, opposing draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.48, requested that it be put to a vote, and will vote against it as a whole.

My delegation wishes to clarify its position on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43, submitted by Japan. As I stated earlier, Security Council resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009), referred to in the fifteenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, are typical examples of the irresponsibility and unfairness of the Security Council.

We have not asked Japan to recognize the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as a nuclear-weapon State and we have no need to do so. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea's nuclear deterrence is a means of self-defence and of safeguarding its sovereignty and people from increasing nuclear threats and blackmail by the United States. However, Japan, ignoring the root cause of the Korean nuclear issue, included the paragraph on the Korean issue in a selective and unfair manner, thus negating the main purposes of the draft resolution itself. Therefore, my delegation proposed a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43 and will vote against it.

Mr. Manfredi (Italy): I wish to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.10, entitled "Treaty on a

Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia". We subscribe to the reference to nuclear-weapon-free zones made on behalf of the European Union presidency in its statement to the First Committee on 13 October (see A/C.1/65/PV.2).

We recall article VII of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which states that nothing in that Treaty affects the right of any group of States to conclude regional treaties in order to assure the total absence of nuclear weapons in their respective territories.

We also acknowledge the importance of nuclear-weapon-free zones to peace and security on the basis of arrangements freely entered into among the States of the region concerned. In that spirit, we welcome the decision of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia. We encourage those States to continue consultations on the Treaty and on article I of its Protocol.

Mr. Propper (Israel): I would like to give an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3*, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

One should expect that United Nations resolutions would be relevant and address current realities. Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3* does not meet that criterion and has little connection with the reality of the Middle East. There is no doubt that the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East indeed exists, yet none of the proliferation risks in the Middle East in recent years have involved Israel. However, all of them have challenged our security. Three of the four widely acknowledged cases of non-compliance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons have taken place in the Middle East, while other cases, such as that of Syria, are currently under investigation.

Such cases demonstrate the cynical attitude of certain States in the region with respect to their international obligations in the nuclear domain. Our region also suffers from the irresponsible proliferation behaviour of some States outside the region that continue to export ballistic missiles and technology related to weapons of mass destruction to countries in the region.

Israel expected that, under the title "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", the

international community would call, at a minimum, for compliance by all States of the region with the relevant international non-proliferation obligations. That is particularly true of Iran's ongoing clandestine nuclear activities, its total disregard of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and Security Council resolutions and its hostile policies and statements, as demonstrated by the Iranian President calling for Israel's destruction.

The draft resolution chooses to ignore the relevant IAEA and Security Council resolutions, as well the evidence contained in IAEA reports regarding such gross violations. Needless to say, the draft resolution focuses entirely on Israel and singles it out, as was the case with an Arab-sponsored resolution at the IAEA General Conference that was rejected by a majority vote.

Adopting such an ill-motivated and unbalanced draft resolution will not serve the greater objective of curbing proliferation in the Middle East, or contribute to the overall objective of advancing peace and security in the Middle East. We call upon representatives to vote against this draft resolution and to distance themselves from attempts aimed at diverting attention from addressing the real risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, thus weakening the credibility of this United Nations body.

Finally, the fact that the sponsors chose to include language that refers to the 2012 conference in this divisive and anti-Israel draft resolution clearly indicates the true intentions of the Arab States with regard to that proposed conference and the negative spirit in which they will approach it.

Ms. Kennedy (United States of America): My delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3*, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

The United States believes that, again this year, the draft resolution fails to meet the fundamental tests of fairness and balance. It confines itself to expressions of concern about the activities of a single country, omitting any reference to other nuclear proliferation concerns in the region. The most glaring omission continues to be the lack of any reference to the violation by some States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in the region of their International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards and NPT obligations and their

failure to cooperate fully and transparently with the IAEA.

Notwithstanding our vote against the draft resolution, I would like to reiterate the long-standing position of my country in support of universal adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. I would also like to highlight our readiness to work with others to build the confidence necessary to ensure the success of a regional conference in 2012 on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of all other weapons of mass destruction, as called for by this year's NPT Review Conference, in which I had the privilege of taking part, together with, I believe, many in this room. That will require that conditions be in place in advance so that the conference can be conducted in a constructive and unbiased way.

Unfortunately, our belief is that raising the 2012 conference in the context of this unbalanced draft resolution hurts and does not help prospects for such an outcome. We find that regrettable. Countries must feel confident that they can attend the 2012 conference and not be isolated or subject to political pressure or attack.

Holding the conference will also require agreement to discuss a broad agenda that includes regional security issues, verification, compliance and all categories of weapons of mass destruction. The United States has already begun to work with others to advance such a positive agenda, but using the First Committee to carry forward regional agendas or to score political points is not the way to begin. I hope that we can do better.

Mr. Lint (Belgium): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3*, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

The EU intends to vote in favour of the draft resolution. The EU has always been fully committed to the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction — nuclear, chemical and biological — and their delivery systems. Therefore, the EU remains committed to the full implementation of the resolutions on the Middle East adopted by the Security Council and by the 1995 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

In addition, the EU supports the mechanism, as agreed by the 2010 NPT Review Conference, for the

implementation of the 1995 NPT resolution on the Middle East, which includes, in particular, the convening by the Secretary-General and the sponsors of the 1995 NPT resolution, in consultation with the States of the region, of a conference in 2012, to be attended by all States of the Middle East, on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at by the States of the region and with the full support and engagement of the nuclear-weapon States.

The EU is ready to put forward concrete measures to contribute to that process, including the organization of a seminar as a follow-up to that organized by the EU in Paris in June 2008. We call on all States in the region that have not yet done so to accede to the NPT and to the Chemical and Biological Weapons Conventions, to ratify and sign the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and to conclude comprehensive safeguards agreements and an additional protocol with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

The EU regrets that this draft resolution is not sufficiently comprehensive in that it does not address all the nuclear proliferation challenges in the region. The draft resolution does not mention the serious proliferation risks related to Iran's nuclear and ballistic programme. By violating its safeguards agreement with the IAEA, continuing not to comply with Security Council resolutions, limiting its cooperation with the IAEA and not meeting the requirements of the IAEA Board of Governors, Iran has raised the serious concern of the international community with regard to the nature of its nuclear programme.

The Security Council's adoption of resolution 1929 (2010) on 9 June 2010 reflects that concern. Iran must comply with Security Council and IAEA Board of Governors resolutions and fully cooperate with the IAEA in order to build confidence in the exclusively peaceful nature of its nuclear programme.

On 22 September in New York, the EU High Representative, on behalf of the EU and the six countries engaged in the diplomatic effort towards Iran, stated that the objective remains to achieve a negotiated, comprehensive and long-term solution that re-establishes the confidence of the international community in the exclusively peaceful nature of the Iranian nuclear programme, while respecting Iran's

legitimate right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy. We call upon Iran to respond positively and without further delay to this offer of dialogue.

The EU also notes the recent reports by the IAEA Director General with regard to Syria. The EU supports the Director General's call for full cooperation with the IAEA's investigations and provision of access to any relevant information related to activities and locations sought by the IAEA. In our view, practical steps such as ratification of the CTBT and the start of negotiations on the fissile material cut-off treaty would be important confidence-building measures in the regional context.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation on two draft resolutions.

The first is the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/65/L.33, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices". It is a source of grave concern and regret that the adoption of resolutions by the General Assembly on certain subjects under discussion within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament has been misused as leverage by some countries to prioritize the items on the agenda of the Conference.

I would like to reiterate that my delegation is of the firm belief that addressing the existence of nuclear weapons as the greatest threat to the security of all nations should be the highest priority in the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Therefore, negotiations on a legally binding instrument on nuclear disarmament — namely a nuclear weapons convention — should be a priority of the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

A treaty to ban fissile material for nuclear weapon purposes should not be developed as a mere non-proliferation instrument. We will never accept such an approach. In this context, the scope of such a possible treaty must cover past and future production of the fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

For the aforementioned reasons, my delegation will not participate in the voting process of the Committee regarding the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/65/L.33.

I would also like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.48, entitled

“Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty”. The Islamic Republic of Iran, as one of the signatory States to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), has been actively participating in the preparatory work of the future CTBT Organization.

While it will vote in favour of the draft, my delegation again will be obliged to abstain with regard to one of its paragraphs because of the language of the text and the way it has been drafted. In principle, in our view the General Assembly can and must express its views on any matter independently, and there is no need to refer to the work of other organs that has been carried out in a completely different context.

Mr. Percaya (Indonesia): Indonesia has requested the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.48, on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).

My Government attaches high priority to international efforts to strengthen the disarmament and non-proliferation regime. The early entry into force of the CTBT is an important step in that direction. It may be recalled, however, that the CTBT is a direct result of the agreements reached at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. During that Conference, the nuclear-weapon States agreed not to conduct further nuclear testing, which was reflected in the conclusion of the CTBT the following year.

We believe that, given the particular status and responsibilities of nuclear-weapon States, their positive and concrete decisions to accelerate their progress towards the entry into force of the CTBT will help in building momentum for the remaining annex 2 countries to follow suit.

In order to contribute to global peace and security from the vantage point of 2010, Indonesia has decided to start its ratification process for the CTBT. Just at the beginning of this month, the President of Indonesia submitted a draft law on the ratification of the CTBT to Parliament. It is hoped that the Government and the House of Representatives will jointly begin consideration of the draft law as soon as possible.

Finally, it is our sincere hope that Indonesia will soon join those countries that are party to the CTBT and that it will thus encourage others that have not yet ratified the Treaty to do so as well. At this session of the First Committee, my delegation will exert further

efforts for the promotion of the entry into force of the CTBT. In that regard, apart from supporting the CTBT draft resolution, Indonesia is one of its sponsors.

Ms. Skorpen (Norway): I am taking the floor with respect to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/65/L.3*, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”, in support of the concerns expressed by the representative of Belgium on behalf of the European Union (EU). Norway intends to vote in favour of the draft resolution, but we share the view of the EU that the draft does not capture all of the nuclear proliferation challenges in the region.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.1. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.1, entitled “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East”, was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 11th meeting, on 15 October 2010. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.1.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3*. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3*, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”, was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 11th meeting, on 15 October 2010. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.3* and A/C.1/65/CRP/Rev.2.

A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3*, which reads as follows:

“Recalling the decision on principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament adopted by the 1995 Review and

Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons on 11 May 1995, in which the Conference urged universal adherence to the Treaty as an urgent priority and called upon all States not yet parties to the Treaty to accede to it at the earliest date, particularly those States that operate unsafeguarded nuclear facilities”.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, 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, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United

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

Against:

India, Israel, Marshall Islands

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan, Pakistan

The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 155 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the sixth preambular paragraph, on which a separate, recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a separate, recorded vote on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3*, which reads as follows:

“Recognizing with satisfaction that, in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Conference undertook to make determined efforts towards the achievement of the goal of universality of the Treaty, called upon those remaining States not parties to the Treaty to accede to it, thereby accepting an international legally binding commitment not to acquire nuclear weapons or nuclear explosive devices and to accept Agency safeguards on all their nuclear activities, and underlined the necessity of universal adherence to the Treaty and of strict compliance by all parties with their obligations under the Treaty”.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Mauritius, Pakistan

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 156 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3* as a whole. 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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, 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, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Canada, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, India, Panama

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3 as a whole was adopted by 155 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.*

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.5. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.5, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 12th meeting, on 18 October 2010. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.5 and A/C.1/65/CRP/Rev.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: El Salvador, Brunei Darussalam and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote 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, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Saudi Arabia,

Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.5 was adopted by 106 votes to none, with 58 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.10*, as orally revised. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.10*, entitled "Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia", was introduced by the representative of Turkmenistan at the 9th meeting, on 13 October 2010. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.10* and A/C.1/65/CRP/Rev.2.

At this meeting, the representative of Turkmenistan introduced an oral revision to paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.10*, by which the word "adoption" would be replaced by the word "submission"

and the word “agreement” would be replaced by the word “treaty”.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote 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, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, 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:

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

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.10, as orally revised, was adopted by 131 votes to 3, with 33 abstentions.*

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/65/L.18. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/65/L.18, entitled “Missiles”, was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the 15th meeting, on 20 October 2010. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.18.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft decision have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to proceed accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/65/L.18 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/65/L.24*. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 5. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.24*, entitled “Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas”, was introduced by the representative of Brazil. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.24* and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.2. The following countries have also become sponsors of the draft resolution: Bahamas, Brunei Darussalam and El Salvador.

A separate, recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.24*, which reads as follows:

“Welcomes the steps taken to conclude further nuclear-weapon-free-zone treaties on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, and calls upon all States to consider all relevant proposals, including those reflected in its resolutions on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East and South Asia”.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic

of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

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

Paragraph 5 was retained by 155 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.24* as a whole. 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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote 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, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and

Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

India, Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.24 as a whole was adopted by 156 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of Jordan, the Sudan and Uzbekistan advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.25. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 12. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.25, entitled “Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments”, was introduced by the representative of Ireland on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition at the 11th meeting, on 15 October 2010. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.25 and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.2.

A separate, recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.25, which reads as follows:

“Reiterates its call upon all States parties to spare no effort to achieve the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and in this regard urges India, Israel and Pakistan to accede to the Treaty as non-nuclear-weapon States promptly and without conditions”.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, 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, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, France, Seychelles, Tonga

Paragraph 12 was retained by 151 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.25 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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote 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, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela

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

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, India, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.25 as a whole was adopted by 158 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.26. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.26, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", was introduced by the representative of India at the 10th meeting, on 14 October 2010. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.26 and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.2. In addition, El Salvador and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote 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, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico,

Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.26 was adopted by 107 votes to 48, with 11 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.27. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.27, entitled “Reducing nuclear danger”, was introduced by the representative of India at the 10th meeting, on 14 October 2010. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.27 and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote 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, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, China, Georgia, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Marshall Islands,

Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Serbia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.27 was adopted by 103 votes to 48, with 14 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.33. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.33, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”, was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 10th meeting, on 14 October 2010. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.33.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

Pakistan

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.33 was adopted by 163 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.41*. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.41*, entitled “Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status”, was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 6th meeting, on 8 October 2010. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/65/L.41* and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.2. In addition, China, the Russian Federation and the United Kingdom have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.41 was adopted.*

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43*. A

recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on paragraphs 2, 8 and 9. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43*, entitled “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, was introduced by the representative of Japan at the 19th meeting, on 26 October 2010. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.43* and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.2.

The Committee will now take a separate vote on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43*, which reads as follows:

“Also reaffirms the vital importance of the universality of the Treaty, and calls on all States not parties to the Treaty to accede as non-nuclear-weapon States to the Treaty promptly and without any conditions and, pending their accession to the Treaty, to adhere to its terms and to take practical steps in support of the Treaty”.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand,

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Bhutan

Paragraph 2 was retained by 158 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a separate vote on paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43*, which reads as follows:

“Urges all States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty at the earliest opportunity, with a view to its early entry into force and universalization, stresses the importance of maintaining existing moratoriums on nuclear-weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosions pending the entry into force of the Treaty, and reaffirms the importance of the continued development of the Treaty verification regime, which will be a significant contribution to providing assurance of compliance with the Treaty”.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

India, Mauritius

Paragraph 8 was retained by 157 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a separate vote on paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43*, which reads as follows:

“Calls for the immediate commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty at the 2011 session of the Conference on Disarmament and its early conclusion, and calls upon all nuclear-weapon States and States not parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to declare and maintain moratoriums on the production of fissile material for any nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices pending the entry into force of the treaty”.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka,

Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

India

Paragraph 9 was retained by 155 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43* as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco,

Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

Brazil, China, Cuba, Guinea-Bissau, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mauritius, Mexico, Myanmar, Pakistan, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43 as a whole was adopted by 154 votes to 1, with 13 abstentions.*

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.48. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Alasaniya (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.48, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", was submitted by the representative of New Zealand. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/65/L.48 and A/C.1/65/CRP.3/Rev.2. In addition, the Bahamas has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

A separate vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.48, which reads as follows:

“Welcoming the adoption by consensus of the conclusions and recommendations for follow-on actions of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which, inter alia, reaffirmed the vital importance of the entry into force of the Treaty as a core element of the international nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime and included specific actions to be taken in support of the entry into force of the Treaty”.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga,

Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 159 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.48 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of

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

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

India, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.48 as a whole was adopted by 161 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

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

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to speak in explanation or vote or position on the draft resolutions and decision just adopted.

Mr. Grinius (Canada): This is an explanation of vote by Canada on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3*, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

In 2009, Canada took the floor after the voting on that year's version of the draft resolution, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East" (resolution 63/84), because the resolution unfairly singled out Israel. Having read this year's draft resolution, we believe that this is again the case. Canada takes this position consistently, both here and on similar resolutions in other forums, including the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Canada notes the call by the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) for a conference of all States of the Middle East region, to be held in 2012, on the establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction and their means of

delivery. Arrangements for such a zone would need to be freely arrived at by the States of the region on the basis of universal security for all. Singling out one country puts the 2012 conference at risk.

If the goal of the draft resolution is the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Middle East, as its title would indicate, then the draft resolution should, in our view, call for all States in the region not only to accede and unequivocally adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, but also to comply fully with all of their obligations.

If the draft resolution is intended to recognize that the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Middle East would pose a serious threat to international peace and security, then it should identify the country that poses the most serious threat of proliferation in the region — Iran.

We regret that Iran has failed to comply with Security Council resolutions 1929 (2010), 1835 (2008), 1803 (2008), 1747 (2007), 1737 (2006) and 1696 (2006), and are gravely concerned by Iran's recent decision to bar IAEA inspectors. Iran has chosen to ignore these Security Council obligations and the efforts of the international community to arrive at an equitable and lasting solution that would meet the concerns of the international community with regard to Iran's intentions.

Canada also remains very concerned about possible undeclared facilities and activities in Syria, and we encourage Syria to cooperate fully with the International Atomic Energy Agency in resolving that matter.

For those reasons, Canada chose again this year to abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. Danon (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to take the floor to speak about two draft resolutions, A/C.1/65/L.10* and A/C.1/65/L.24, on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.10*, "Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia", I recall that the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States have been in contact with the five Central Asian States on a number of occasions in an effort to resolve problems that have prevented their ratification of the Protocol to the

Treaty. We are encouraged by the expression of readiness of the Central Asian States to consult with us on outstanding issues.

We remain convinced that nuclear-weapon-free zones can help to strengthen the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and consolidate regional stability, while providing meaningful negative security assurances to the members of such zones.

Currently, there are several outstanding issues for which a mutually acceptable resolution would be necessary in order for each of us to make further progress towards our respective accession to the Protocol to the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia. Regarding the new Treaty, our primary concern remains article 12, which stipulates that existing treaty obligations of the States parties would not be affected by the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia. Nevertheless, we support the objective of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia and underscore our readiness to consult with the five Central Asian States in order to arrive at a mutually satisfactory outcome.

Turning to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.24, France, the United Kingdom and the United States stress the importance we attach to the development, where appropriate, of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free-zones. Such zones can make a significant contribution to regional and global security, provided that they are established in accordance with the 1999 guidelines of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. In other words, they must, first, be supported by all States of the region concerned and by nuclear-weapon States. Secondly, they must be subject to the appropriate treaties and to the comprehensive safeguards established by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Thirdly, they must be satisfactorily concluded in consultation with the nuclear-weapon States.

We therefore continue to believe that it is contradictory to propose the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone that would consist largely of the high seas while simultaneously affirming that the zone would be fully consistent with applicable principles and rules of international law relating to the freedom of the high seas and the rights of passage through maritime space, including those of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

We continue to ask ourselves whether the real goal of the draft resolution is in fact the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone covering the high seas. We do not believe that this ambiguity has been sufficiently clarified. For that reason, we have voted against the draft resolution again this year.

We wish to place on record our appreciation to the sponsors of the draft resolution for their willingness to constructively discuss our concerns, both here in First Committee and beforehand. We welcome the changes made to the text in comparison with resolution 64/44, in particular those referring to the prospect of additional ratifications of the relevant protocols to nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties. In that regard, we reiterate that we continue to stand ready to resume consultations with the States parties to the treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones so as to reach a mutually satisfactory outcome regarding the outstanding issues.

Mr. Rao (India): I have asked for the floor to explain India's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/65/L.3*, A/C.1/65/L.24*, A/C.1/65/L.25 and A/C.1/65/L.43*.

India abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3* 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 to those States remaining outside the NPT to accede to it and to accept International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards on all of their nuclear activities is at variance with that principle and does not reflect current realities.

India voted against paragraph 5 and abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.24* as a whole. We believe that the call made in paragraph 5 for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia contravenes the well-established principle that nuclear-weapon-free zones must be established on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. This specific proposal has no greater validity than proposals to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world,

such as East Asia, Western Europe or North America, where nuclear weapons also exist and are deployed.

On draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.25, India remains committed to the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. We are concerned about the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use or threat of use. India also shares the view that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing. We continue to believe that the best and most effective non-proliferation measure would be a credible, time-bound programme for global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament.

We voted against the draft resolution and its paragraph 12, since India cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear-weapon State. In urging India to accede to the NPT “promptly and without conditions”, the draft resolution negates the rules of customary international law, as enshrined in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which provides that a State’s acceptance, ratification or accession to a treaty must be based on the principle of free consent.

India’s position on the NPT is well known. There is no question of India’s joining the NPT as a non-nuclear weapon State. Nuclear weapons are an integral part of India’s national security and will remain so, pending non-discriminatory and global nuclear disarmament.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43*, India remains committed to the goal of global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament in a time-bound framework. We have repeatedly stressed the need for a step-by-step process underwritten by a universal commitment and an agreed multilateral framework for achieving global and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament. In substantive terms, the draft resolution falls short of that objective.

India voted against paragraph 2, as we cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear-weapon State. India’s position on the NPT is well known. There is no question of India’s joining the NPT as a non-nuclear weapon State. Nuclear weapons are an integral part of India’s national security and will remain so, pending non-discriminatory and global nuclear disarmament.

India abstained in the voting on paragraph 8, consistent with its position on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. As India supports the commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty in the Conference on Disarmament, the question of a moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons does not arise. Hence we have abstained in the voting on paragraph 9 of the draft resolution.

Mr. Gumbi (South Africa): I have requested the floor to explain South Africa’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43*, entitled “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”.

Paragraph 12 of the draft resolution makes reference to the question of security assurances in the context of Security Council resolution 984 (1995). In that regard, I wish to place on record that the issue of security assurances remains of great importance to South Africa. In that connection, my delegation has often stated that genuine security cannot be achieved solely by the non-nuclear-weapon States’ abandoning the nuclear weapons option and that the only guarantee against the use of nuclear weapons is their total elimination.

South Africa believes that security assurances are not an ultimate objective in and of themselves, but a pragmatic, interim and practical measure aimed at strengthening the quest for a nuclear-weapon-free world. My delegation does not believe that the security assurances granted under Security Council resolution 984 (1995) are adequate, or that security assurances granted in the context of the existing treaties for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones provide sufficient guarantees to all of the non-nuclear-weapon States.

Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, South Africa believes that efforts to conclude a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States should be pursued as a matter of priority. South Africa’s views on the matter are well known. My delegation’s insistence on the provision of legally binding security assurances to States that have forgone the nuclear weapons option under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is based on our belief that it would enhance the security of non-nuclear-weapon States under the Treaty.

The principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons recognized that steps should be considered to assure non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and that those steps could take the form of an internationally legally binding instrument.

The Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference (NPT/CONF.2000/28 (Parts I and II)) reflects the agreement of States parties that legally binding security assurances by the nuclear-weapon States to the non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT would strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime. The 2010 NPT Review Conference also recognized the legitimate interests of non-nuclear weapon States in receiving unequivocal and legally binding security assurances from nuclear-weapon States, which could strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

Draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.43*, unfortunately, does not take any of the foregoing into account or recognize the aspirations of non-nuclear-weapon States to the provision of security assurances in the context of an internationally legally binding instrument. Instead, it only focuses narrowly on security assurances in the context of Security Council resolution 984 (1995), which is why my delegation abstained in the voting on it.

Mr. Tarar (Pakistan): I have taken the floor to explain my delegation's position on draft resolutions A/C.1/65/L.3*, A/C.1/65/L.24*, A/C.1/65/L.25, A/C.1/65/L.33, A/C.1/65/L.43* and A/C.1/65/L.48.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3*, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", my delegation has consistently supported the central objective of the draft resolution. However, the draft text places lopsided emphasis on the recommendations and conclusions emanating from various review conferences of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We are also disappointed by the unrealistic call on Pakistan to join the NPT. Our position on that important issue is clear and well known. My delegation therefore voted in favour of the draft text as a whole, while abstaining on the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs.

As for draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.24*, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", Pakistan has always supported the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in accordance with arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. However, the call in paragraph 5 for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia fails to acknowledge the reality on the ground.

We would like to recall that Pakistan itself sought to promote this subject in the region for 24 years until the nuclearization of South Asia in 1998. The nuclear explosions in South Asia on 11 and 13 May 1998 disrupted the strategic balance in the region. With these explosions, the objective of creating a zone free of nuclear weapons was defeated. Pakistan was obliged, accordingly, to conduct its tests in order to restore strategic stability in the region.

My delegation appreciates the efforts of the sponsors in revising the contents of the draft resolution to accommodate Pakistan's position on nuclear-weapon-free zones. However, since the current draft text retains the call for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, our delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 5.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.25, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", we are disappointed at the selective and discriminatory language of paragraph 12, which calls upon Pakistan to unconditionally accede to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State. We also cannot accept references to NPT review conferences and their recommendations in the text due to our known position on the Treaty. Our delegation therefore decided to abstain in the voting on that draft resolution as a whole and to vote against paragraph 12.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.33, regarding a fissile material cut-off treaty, we were obliged to vote against it because it calls for negotiations on a treaty that will only ban future production of fissile materials but will not seek to reduce the existing huge stockpiles of such materials. Such a treaty will be inherently flawed, as it will freeze the existing asymmetry in fissile materials stock in perpetuity.

For Pakistan, the situation has been further exacerbated by the discriminatory nuclear cooperation agreements signed by some of the major nuclear-

weapon States, as well as some prominent advocates of the NPT. As a result of these agreements, these States have not only violated their NPT obligations, but have also made a mockery of the proposed fissile material cut-off treaty. Since these agreements will undermine Pakistan's security, Pakistan cannot be a party to such a draft resolution.

Coming to the draft resolution entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", contained in document A/C.1/65/L.43*, my delegation does not agree with several of its provisions. The draft resolution places lopsided emphasis on non-proliferation rather than on nuclear disarmament. This indeed reflects a regression in this vital area. In accordance with our consistent position, we cannot accept calls to accede to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State without conditions, nor do we consider ourselves bound by any of the provisions emanating from the NPT review conferences or other forums in which Pakistan is not represented.

While my delegation supports the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, it cannot agree to some of the proposals in the draft resolution, such as for the immediate commencement of fissile material cut-off treaty negotiations that are selective, discriminatory and unrealistic. In view of these reservations, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and voted against paragraphs 2 and 9.

As for the draft resolution entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", contained in document A/C.1/65/L.48, over the years Pakistan has consistently supported the objectives of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). We have been voting in favour of this resolution in the Committee; we voted for the draft resolution this year as well. My delegation continues to believe that the objective of the call in the draft resolution for promoting signatures and ratifications leading to the entry into force of the CTBT will be facilitated when major erstwhile proponents of the CTBT decide to ratify it. Acceptance of the CTBT obligations on a regional basis in South Asia will also help expedite its entry into force.

The draft resolution refers to conclusions and recommendations of the NPT review conference. We wish to reiterate that we do not consider ourselves bound by any of the provisions that emanate from NPT review conferences or any other forum in which

Pakistan is not represented. Therefore, our delegation was constrained to abstain in the voting on the sixth preambular paragraph.

Mr. Seger (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): Switzerland would like to make a statement in explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/65/L.3*, A/C.1/65/L.26 and A/C.1/65/L.27.

On draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3*, Switzerland once again voted in favour of the draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". The draft resolution promotes the universalization of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in the Middle East. Switzerland fully endorses this goal. We also welcome the specific measures adopted by the 2010 NPT Review Conference regarding the creation in the Middle East of a zone free from nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction.

However, Switzerland notes that, in its operative paragraphs, the draft resolution refers to only one of the elements having to do with the risk of nuclear proliferation in the region. By voting in favour of the draft resolution, Switzerland demonstrated the importance it attaches to the full implementation of the obligations arising from the NPT by all the States in the region. In this respect, the full cooperation of those States with the relevant international bodies, starting with the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Security Council, is paramount, as is the full implementation of decisions and resolutions adopted by these entities.

In order to implement the current draft resolution and to attain the goal of preventing nuclear proliferation as widely as possible, it is crucial that States take into account the current context and all developments affecting all the countries in the region.

I will now move on to draft resolutions A/C.1/65/L.26 and A/C.1/65/L.27. Switzerland voted against the draft resolutions entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons" and "Reducing nuclear danger", thereby reiterating its position of previous years regarding these resolutions.

Switzerland once again voted against the resolution entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", even though it is convinced of the ultimate need to develop a legally binding framework to ban nuclear weapons and

although it believes that an instrument outlawing the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is an essential component of such an arrangement. Our vote against the draft resolution was due, above all, to its lack of any reference to the international non-proliferation regime. Switzerland believes that a resolution seeking to prohibit the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons should at least contain a reference to this international non-proliferation regime. Absent any reference of this kind, it is difficult for Switzerland to adopt any other voting position.

On the draft resolution in document A/C.1/65/L.27, Switzerland fully supports the broad objective of the draft resolution to move nuclear disarmament forward, reduce nuclear danger and ultimately eliminate nuclear weapons. Switzerland is a staunch advocate of revising security policy doctrines aimed at diminishing the role of nuclear weapons and reducing the operational readiness of nuclear weapon systems.

However, Switzerland believes that the scope of the draft resolution does not fully reflect realities in the nuclear sphere. A major difficulty for my delegation is the fact that the draft calls only on the five nuclear-weapon States recognized by the NPT to take measures. In our opinion, the nuclear threat will be reduced only if all nuclear-weapon States re-examine their doctrines and take steps to reduce the risks that are closely linked to nuclear arsenals.

Like draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.26, this draft resolution is sadly devoid of any reference to key international treaties such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. We believe that these instruments are essential to achieving the objectives of these draft resolutions.

In conclusion, however, Switzerland welcomes the fact that a dialogue has been launched with respect to these two draft resolutions for the first time since they were brought before the First Committee. Such dialogue is essential if the Committee wants to develop these texts and ensure that they enjoy broader support in the long term.

Mr. Jerman (Slovenia): I would like to comment on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/65/L.10*, entitled "Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia", in the voting on which my delegation abstained.

Slovenia, like other members of the European Union, supports the concept of nuclear-weapon free zones, as pointed out by Ambassador Lint of Belgium in his statement on behalf of the European Union in this Committee's thematic debate on nuclear issues on 13 October (see A/C.1/65/PV.9). In this context, Slovenia welcomes the decision of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia.

My country believes that nuclear-weapon-free zones represent an important contribution to international peace and security and a step forward on our path to a world free of nuclear weapons. Nuclear-weapon-free zones must be established on the basis of the free will of the States concerned and of relevant guidelines adopted by the Security Council.

Slovenia would therefore invite those States to continue consultations on the Treaty and on article 1 of its Protocol.

Ms. Higgie (New Zealand): I take the floor to explain New Zealand's voting position on the three draft resolutions contained respectively in documents A/C.1/65/L.3*, A/C.1/65/L.27 and A/C.1/65/L.43*.

New Zealand voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.3, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". Consistent with our belief in the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world, New Zealand is a strong and long-standing supporter of the universalization of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We are committed to the realization of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, as mandated by the States parties to the NPT in 1995 and reaffirmed by the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

We strongly support the decision taken at the 2010 Review Conference to convene a conference in 2012 on establishing the zone. The International Atomic Energy Agency will have a crucial role to play in verifying such a zone. We therefore urge all States that have not yet done so, including in the Middle East, to sign, ratify and implement an additional protocol to allow the Agency to undertake its important work.

New Zealand wishes, however, to place on record our concern regarding the absence in the draft resolution of any reference to other States in the Middle East that present significant nuclear

proliferation concerns. We would hope that it will be possible to address this lack of balance in future years.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.27, I emphasize that New Zealand has a deep and enduring commitment to the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world. Our work in the New Agenda Coalition and in a number of other contexts, including advocating the de-alerting of nuclear weapons, reflects our belief in the need to take immediate practical steps towards the achievement of that goal. While the draft resolution, entitled “Reducing nuclear danger”, contains a number of practical measures of which we are strong and active advocates, we were unable to support the text and voted against it, given that it fails to acknowledge the importance of the universalization of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a step towards a nuclear-weapon-free world, and the responsibility of all States which possess nuclear weapons to reduce nuclear danger.

Finally, with regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/65/L.43*, entitled “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”, submitted by Japan, New Zealand supported

the draft resolution in recognition of our strong agreement with its overall intention and thrust. We are pleased that in a number of instances the draft resolution seeks to reinforce the May 2010 NPT Review Conference outcome, which in the view of my Government provides a clear outline for our work in the short term to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world.

There are two aspects of the draft resolution on which New Zealand wishes to comment. The first is the operational readiness of nuclear weapon systems, an issue upon which my delegation attaches considerable importance. Given the call made by the Review Conference on the nuclear-weapon States in this regard, we would have liked to have seen the retention of language from previous years that called upon the nuclear-weapon States to consider further reducing the operational status of nuclear weapon systems in ways that promote international stability and security. Likewise, the text on negative security assurances could have more closely reflected the relevant language in the 2010 NPT Review Conference Final Document (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)).

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.