



General Assembly

Seventieth session

First Committee

25th meeting

Thursday, 5 November 2015, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Van Oosterom (Netherlands)

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

Agenda items 88 to 105 (continued)

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

The Chair: As I announced shortly before we adjourned yesterday, we will begin today by hearing those delegations that wish to speak in explanation of vote or position on cluster 5, “Other disarmament measures and international security”.

Before I call on the first speaker, I would urge all speakers to keep their statements brief so that we can finish the action phase tomorrow, which is in the interest of all of us.

Ms. Guitton (France) (*spoke in French*): I should like to deliver the following explanation of position on behalf of the United Kingdom and France, which joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.7, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”.

We wish to make it clear that the United Kingdom and France operate under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms-control and disarmament agreements. We see no direct connection, as stated in this draft resolution, between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control.

I should also like to deliver an explanation of position, on behalf of the United Kingdom and France, on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.10, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”. The United Kingdom and France joined the consensus on this draft resolution. We support the mainstreaming of disarmament issues in development policy, particularly in the field of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons, and disarmament demobilization and reintegration. That said, we feel it necessary to clarify our position on other aspects of this text.

The notion of a symbiotic relationship between disarmament and development appears questionable to us as the conditions conducive to disarmament are not necessarily dependent on development only, as is seen with the growing military expenditure of some developing countries. There is no automatic link between the two, but rather a complex relationship that this notion does not accurately capture. Moreover, the idea according to which military expenditure directly diverts funding from development requirements should be nuanced, given that defence investments are also necessary to peacekeeping, improving response to natural disasters — the provision of airborne and maritime equipment, for example — and, in certain conditions, promoting stability.

Finally, we consider that the report of the Group of Governmental Experts (see A/59/119) does not give sufficient credit to unilateral, bilateral and multilateral actions in disarmament and non-proliferation.

Mr. McGuire (United States of America): I have asked for the floor to offer an explanation of position

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

15-35212 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



on two draft resolutions in cluster 5: A/C.1/70/L.7 and A/C.1/70/L.10.

The United States did not participate in action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.7, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”. The United States operates under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms-control and disarmament agreements. We see no direct connection, as stated in this draft resolution, between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control, and do not consider this a matter germane to the First Committee.

The United States also did not participate in the Committee’s action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.10, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”. My Government believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues. Accordingly, we do not consider ourselves bound by the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development that was adopted in September 1987.

Mrs. Del Sol Dominguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Cuba would like to explain its position with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.17, entitled “Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures”, which was adopted without a vote.

The topic addressed in draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.17 has been considered by the First Committee for many years, particularly since 1980, when the General Assembly adopted resolution 35/142, relating to the United Nations system for normalizing information on military expenditure. The delegation of Cuba decided to join the consensus on the text of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.17, as it has done in the past.

At the same time, we wish to place on record that, as we have informed the sponsors of the draft resolution in due time, we do not agree with the wording of the ninth preambular paragraph, which welcomes the establishment of a group of governmental experts pursuant to resolution 68/23. When the Group of Governmental Experts was established, our delegation noted that we were not convinced that there was a need to establish another group of experts to review the functioning of the United Nations Standardized Instrument for Reporting Military Expenditures, but

that we should focus on the existing group. We maintain that position.

Cuba believes that the creation of groups of experts should not be the rule but the exception. Priority should be given to open and transparent discussions and negotiations on this topic in which all member States have an opportunity to participate on an equal footing. Moreover, we joined the consensus on the draft resolution on the understanding that any eventual recommendation that might be considered by the Group of Governmental Experts must respect the Standardized Instrument for Reporting Military Expenditures and can in no way modify the voluntary nature of participation in the Instrument.

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

The Committee will now turn to informal paper No. 4, beginning with cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security”.

I give the floor to the representative of the United States on a point of order.

Ms. Crittenberger (United States of America): Early this morning, we received a note from the Secretariat on how to handle draft resolutions A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1, A/C.1/70/L.25, A/C.1/70/L.28/Rev.1, A/C.1/70/L.36 and A/C.1/70/L.48. It seems to us that before we start action on today’s items we might have a discussion of that.

The Chair: Because another delegation has also raised this point, the Chair suggested having informal consultations with Mr. Kim Won-soo, the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs. We hope that will proceed this morning.

I give the floor to the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

Mr. Rowland (United Kingdom): The point is that we will not be able to proceed to action on any of those draft resolutions until we have resolved this issue, so we want to make that quite clear now. We feel that the statement that was issued did not reflect the discussion or inputs that were made yesterday and that the statement will need to be reissued reflecting those discussions before we can move to take action. We are happy to work with the Secretariat to try to resolve

the differences, but I would like to put that marker down now.

The Chair: The statement of the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom is duly noted.

I give the floor to the representative of India on a point of order.

Mr. Varma (India): Mr. Chair, it is not our intention to stand in the way of how you intend to proceed this morning, but the points raised by the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom merit some consideration. Of course, we are in your hands on how best you think this should be taken forward.

We had an open discussion yesterday in the presence of the High Representative, and we thank him for all the efforts that he is continuing to make to find an acceptable resolution of the very important issue that stands before us. If we have indeed begun on a note of open consultation, it is our view that these consultations should be taken forward in a similar open format. We are entirely in your hands on when you wish to allot time for such a discussion. We would also like to state that we have some comments to make on the draft that has been put up on QuickFirst and which has been made available to all delegations. We are in your hands, but this is an important issue to move forward.

The Chair: I acknowledge what representatives are saying. At the same time, if we look at the Committee's programme of work and where we are at this moment and the ambition of the Committee as a whole to finish all procedures by the end of tomorrow, it is important that we now proceed with our work. I have taken note of what has been said.

I give the floor to the representative of China on a point of order.

Mr. Fu Cong (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I just want to say that we have not even received the statement from the Secretariat.

The Chair: It is on QuickFirst.

I give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation on a point of order.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): First, I should like to stress that the Russian Federation fully aligns itself with the statement just made by our colleague from India. From our perspective, we would like particularly to underscore

that it would be very useful for all of us to be able to understand the very serious developments before us. It is not merely about the possibility of utilizing the resources of the Conference on Disarmament; this is not simply a political but also a financial issue concerning the only mechanism that can and should address issues relating to, in particular, nuclear disarmament within the framework of a balanced programme of work. We draw the attention of our colleagues to the fact that we need to question why we are undermining the only mechanism available to us. We must not delude ourselves. No open-ended working group can replace the high degree of professionalism and deep expertise of the Conference on Disarmament.

For several years, now we have not been able to reach agreement, but that in no way means that the Conference on Disarmament is failing. It means that we are working poorly. Do delegations really think that if we were to meet in an open-ended working group of whatever makeup, we would be able to work any better than we could within the Conference on Disarmament? Such an illusion is very dangerous. It is also very risky to undermine the only United Nations mechanism that is consensus-based and responsible for carrying forward negotiations. We need to continue our discussions and negotiations to ensure that this mechanism can continue to function. I wish to make that point strongly.

The Chair: Before I call on the next speaker I would call on the Committee to think of our collective time schedule.

I give the floor to the representative of France on a point of order.

Ms. Guitton (France) (*spoke in French*): I simply want to take the floor to formally record the fact that my delegation entirely shares the concerns raised by the delegations of the United States, the United Kingdom and India. It is urgent that we move forward in additional consultations to find a solution. Committee members may rest assured that my delegation stands more than willing to contribute to these discussions so that we can make headway in the actions that we need to take within the setting of the First Committee.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of Israel on a point of order.

Ms. Rahaminoff-Honig (Israel): I should like also to echo the sentiments expressed by the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, India and

France. While we thank the High Representative for taking the time to address us yesterday, we too have concerns with regard to the method of funding suggested with regard to the programme budget implications. We think this could complicate further the work of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) and its attempts to achieve consensus on a programme of work. It might even discourage some CD member States from exerting their utmost efforts in forging agreements forward. It would have been preferable to find funding from within existing means available to the United Nations or some other solutions, and certainly not favour one aspect of the disarmament machinery over the other.

The Chair: Once again, I reiterate that in my view we should proceed now with cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security”.

The issue which has been raised by several delegations is quite clear and duly noted. It also means that before we get to cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”, on page 2 of informal paper No. 4, that issue will have to be resolved. I have heard the message from the Committee loud and clear. At the same time, it is in the collective interests of all of us to proceed with the voting on cluster 6. I now call on all delegations to try to refrain from additional statements.

I give the floor to the representative of Mexico on a point of order.

Mr. Sandoval (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I merely want to thank the Secretariat for having circulated the long-awaited note on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1. As I am sure delegations are aware, my delegation was not mistaken. The precedent of 2012 has been duly taken into account. The draft resolution does not have programme budget implications and can be financed as in the past, using resources from the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

My delegation would like to reiterate the readiness it has displayed throughout this process to engage in dialogue to find a solution. In point of fact, it is sad to note that a body such as the Conference on Disarmament has been stagnant, blocked and dormant for 18 years, and those countries that have a genuine desire to make headway in the process of nuclear disarmament need to find a way out of this impasse. That is what the open-ended working groups are made for.

The Chair: For me it is quite simple. I live in New York. I can continue on Monday. We can really proceed for a very long time on a procedural discussion at this moment, but I would like to call on all representatives to now proceed with cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security” and refrain from making additional statements, with the ambition of finishing our work tomorrow.

The Committee will now turn to informal paper No. 4, beginning with cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security”. We shall start with step one of the four-step process.

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

We shall first proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.5, entitled “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.5 was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the Committee’s 20th meeting, on 29 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.5 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.6.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.5 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.5 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.18, entitled “Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.18 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the Committee’s 20th meeting, on 29 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/70/L.18.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, 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:

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

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.18 was adopted by 116 to 3, with 46 absentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Madagascar, Nicaragua and the Niger informed 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.1/70/L.31, entitled "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.31 was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 29 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.31 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.6.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.31 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.31 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.33, entitled "Regional disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.33 was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 29 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.33 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.6.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.33 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.33 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.34, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.34 was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 29 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.34 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.6.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2. I shall put that paragraph to the vote first.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

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

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 133 votes to 1, with 36 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.34, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San

Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Albania, Austria, Bhutan, Palau, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.34, as a whole, was adopted by 169 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

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

Mr. Varma (India): We would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.34. India voted against the draft resolution, as well as operative paragraph 2, which requests the Conference on Disarmament to consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control.

In our view, the Conference on Disarmament, as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has the vocation of negotiating disarmament instruments of global application. In 1993, the United Nations Disarmament Commission adopted by consensus guidelines and recommendations for regional disarmament. There is no need, therefore, for the Conference on Disarmament to engage in formulating principles on the same subject at a time when it has several other priority issues on its agenda.

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

The Chair: In view of the discussions and issues raised by various representatives at the beginning of

this meeting, we have been in contact with the Office of the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, and he will come to the Committee before the end of today's meeting to have the discussion that was asked for by several representatives.

The Committee will now turn to informal paper 4, cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

I now give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce new or revised draft resolutions under cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

Mrs. Del Sol Dominguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to make a general statement on cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". Briefly, Cuba would like to state that it supports and is one of the sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/70/L.11, entitled "Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament", introduced on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

We believe that the convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament would have a positive impact and serve to revitalize and update the United Nations disarmament machinery, and can no longer be put off. We call on all member States to support the draft decision and to participate actively and constructively in the work of the Working Group in 2016 and 2017 with a view to adopting specific recommendations.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.8, Cuba supports the work of the United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament, which help to inform and educate public opinion and garner support for the goals of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament, development and the promotion of peace. The activities of the regional centres must continue to be developed in ongoing and close consultation with States of the regions in question and on the basis of the centres' mandates, as agreed in the First Committee and the General Assembly.

While we welcome and recognize the importance of voluntary financial contributions that some countries provide to facilitate the work of the regional centres, we emphasize that the interests of donors in specific terms cannot in any way affect the balanced implementation of the mandates that the member States have assigned to the regional centres. We shall continue to underscore

the important work of the Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, and have therefore co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.42.

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

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.8, entitled “United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.8 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee’s 20th meeting, on 29 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/70/L.8. In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.8, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide all support necessary, within existing resources, to the regional centres in carrying out their programmes of activities. The implementation of the request would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, Disarmament, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017. The provision contained therein covers the three director posts at the P-5 level, the three political affairs officers at the P-3 level, three General Service local-level administrative assistants at the GS-7 level and one General Service local-level post at the GS-6 level of the regional centres, and also includes general operating costs of the centres.

The programmes of activities of the three regional centres would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.8, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 68/246, of 27 December

2013, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters; and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.8 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.8 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/70/L.11, entitled “Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/70/L.11 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee’s 18th meeting, on 27 October. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/70/L.11. In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph (a) of the draft decision, the General Assembly, recalling its resolution 65/66 of 8 December 2010 and its decision 69/518, of 2 December 2014, would decide to hold, at a later date, an organizational session of the Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament for the purpose of setting a date for its substantive sessions in 2016 and 2017, and that the Working Group should submit a report on its work, including possible substantive recommendations, before the end of the seventy-second session of the General Assembly.

Pursuant to the request contained in paragraph (a) of the draft decision, it is envisaged that the Open-ended Working Group would hold in New York one organizational session — that is to say, one meeting in 2016 — and one substantive session of five days’ duration, for a total of 10 meetings in 2016. The aforementioned meetings would require interpretation in all six official languages and a total

of 11 documents — two pre-session, seven in session and two post-session in 2016 — to be issued in all six official languages. The provisions for conference servicing and documentation for the organizational meeting and the meetings of the Open-ended Working Group in 2016 have been included under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and conference management of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017”.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft decision A/C.1/70/L.11, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017. Furthermore, if no meetings take place in 2016 the aforementioned provision of conference servicing and documentation will be carried over to 2017.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Draft decision A/C.1/70/L.11 was adopted by 173 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.14, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.14 was introduced by the representative of New Zealand at the Committee's 19th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is named in document A/C.1/69/L.14. In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.14, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to ensure and to strengthen, if needed, the provision to the Conference on Disarmament of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services. It is recalled that the resources for the substantive and secretarial support for the Conference on Disarmament are included under section 4, “Disarmament”, and that resources for conference servicing are included under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and conference management of the

proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017”.

Subject to decisions taken at the 2016 session of the Conference on Disarmament to establish its programme of work for 2016 and to establish any subsidiary bodies for its implementation, the strengthening of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services to the Conference as requested in operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution may entail additional resource requirements under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017. Consequently, the established procedure on the preparation of a statement of programme budget implications would be followed, as necessary, in the context of actions taken by the Conference on Disarmament. At this time, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.14 would not give rise to any programme budget implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.14 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.14 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.29, entitled “Report of the Disarmament Commission”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.29 was introduced by the representative of Senegal at the Committee’s 18th meeting, on 27 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is named in document A/C.1/70/L.29.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.29 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.29 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.42, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.42 was introduced by the representative of Peru on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States. The sponsor of the draft resolution is named in document A/C.1/70/L.42.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.42 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.42 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.43/Rev.2, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.43/Rev.2 was introduced by the representative of Angola at the Committee’s 20th meeting, on 29 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is named in A/C.1/70/L.43/Rev.2.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.43/Rev.2 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.43/Rev.2 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.53, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.53 was introduced by the representative of Nepal at the Committee’s 19th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.53 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.6. In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.53, the General Assembly would request the

Secretary-General to make arrangements for the early resumption of the operations of the Regional Centre from Kathmandu. Given that the Regional Centre's relocation to Bangkok was due to an earthquake that struck its host country, Nepal, in 2015, no provision has been included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017 for the resumption of operations from Kathmandu, Nepal.

At the present time it is not possible to estimate the potential cost implications pursuant to the implementation of paragraph 6 of the draft resolution. Such cost estimates shall be assessed at the time when the decision is made. This may give rise to additional budgetary requirements.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 68/246, of 27 December 2013, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of South Africa on a point of order.

Mr. Wensley (South Africa): Having listened to the Secretary of the Committee, if we are going to take action on this particular draft resolution, what are the implications that we are entering into? I note that the Centre has moved from Kathmandu to Bangkok, but what are the implications that we are faced with in terms of a Committee that needs to make a decision, and I as an individual who needs to inform my Fifth Committee representative? What are we deciding here?

The Chair: I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): I am not able to add anything to what was stated in the oral statement.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of India on a point of order.

Mr. Varma (India): We would ask you, Mr. Chair, to stick to the procedure that you yourself have outlined, and which has been consistently followed by this Committee. We are in the process of adopting this

draft resolution. I do not think this is the time to raise questions. If the concerned delegation has reason to raise issues, it can exercise its right to explain its vote or position at the end of the process. We request you to stick to the procedure that you yourself have outlined.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.53 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.53 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.57, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.57 was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 26 October, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.57 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.6. In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 10 and 11 of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.57 the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to facilitate close cooperation between the Regional Centre and the African Union, in particular in the areas of disarmament, peace and security; and also requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Regional Centre with the support necessary for greater achievements and results.

The implementation of the request contained in paragraph 10 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

Regarding paragraph 11, provisions under section 4, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017 cover one P-5 post, one P-3 post and one GS-7 General Service post, one GS-6 General Service post and general operating expenses. The programme activities of the Regional Centre would

continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.57, no additional requirements would arise in respect of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 68/246, of 27 December 2013, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.57 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.57 was adopted.

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

Mr. Rowland (United Kingdom): I am taking the floor on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States to explain our delegations' abstentions on draft decision A/C.1/70/L.11, entitled "Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament". The decision in A/C.1/70/L.11 is based on the provisions of General Assembly resolution 65/66, on which our three delegations abstained on budgetary and substantive grounds. These reasons remain valid, and therefore our delegations decided to maintain our abstention.

Ms. Ramos (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Cuba joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.43/Rev.2, entitled "Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa". We believe that the text appropriately reflects the broad scope and relevance of the activities carried out by the Advisory Committee. Although we support the text as a whole, we wish to place on record that the delegation of Cuba disassociates itself from the fifth preambular paragraph, which welcomes the Arms Trade Treaty, because the Treaty

does not enjoy the endorsement of all States Members of the United Nations.

Mr. McGuire (United States of America): I have asked for the floor to offer an explanation of position on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.53, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", on behalf of the United Kingdom and the United States. The United Kingdom and the United States joined the consensus on this draft resolution on the assumption that there would be no programme budget implications for this draft resolution in the upcoming biennium. If the draft does result in any programme budget implications, it must be properly vetted by all appropriate parties.

We also express our heartfelt sympathies to the people of Nepal affected by the tragic earthquake on 25 April.

Mr. Wensley (South Africa): My delegation fully supports the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.53. As to the comment that was made by another delegation on procedural matters and when we should proceed to refrain from making statements, I wish to remind that representative that if there are explanations from the Secretariat on implications that are involved — and I am speaking of implications arising from the movement of the Regional Centre from Kathmandu to Bangkok — surely we should be able to raise those issues if they have not been discussed in depth beforehand.

Mr. Biontino (Germany): I should like to give an explanation of vote concerning draft decision A/C.1/70/L.11, entitled "Open-ended Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament", on behalf of Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and my own country, which voted for this decision as we did in 2014.

Our decision continues to be based on the conviction that the United Nations disarmament machinery urgently needs political impulses towards revitalization and the resumption of its main task, negotiating multilateral instruments in the field of disarmament. It is against this backdrop that we voted in favour of the decision, which aims at starting the implementation of resolution 65/66 by holding at a later stage an organizational session of the Open-ended

Working Group on the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-IV).

In this context, we would like to point out that we also supported draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.25, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”. This draft resolution, in our view, includes a complementary effort to revitalize the multilateral disarmament machinery. We would like to stress, however, that the pursuit of an SSOD-IV is neither an alternative nor a reason for postponing efforts to overcome the stalemate of the Conference on Disarmament and implementing the relevant disarmament and non-proliferation commitments.

Finally, we would like to emphasize that we deem the financial resources needed, if any, to convene the organizational session of the Open-ended Working Group to be subject to the regular budgetary procedure and scrutiny of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions as well as of the Fifth Committee. Furthermore, we expect the secretariat of the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs not to bring forward budget implications for the budget 2016-2017 in that context. Should the Open-ended Working Group convene at a later stage, the same applies to the following budget negotiations.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation would like to place on record that it disassociates itself from the consensus on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.43/Rev.2, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”, for the same reason cited in our explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.54, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”.

Mr. Primasto (Indonesia): Indonesia has decided to go along with the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.43/Rev.2, but wishes to place on record that it also disassociates itself from the fifth preambular paragraph, as we are not in a position to support the Arms Trade Treaty as of now.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions adopted under on cluster 7.

Before proceeding to cluster 1, as laid out in informal paper No. 4, several delegations have indicated this morning their wish to first have another meeting with the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs as a follow-up to the discussion we had yesterday at the end of our meeting.

I give the floor to the representative of Ecuador on a point of order.

Mr. Luque Márquez (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have just verified that the programme budget implications for draft resolutions A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1 and A/C.1/70/L.28/Rev.1, among others, have been published on the QuickFirst website. The Secretariat has fulfilled its administrative task of providing programme budget implications for the decisions of the Committee. It is not the Committee’s role to revise programme budget implications or their contents. We can discuss this issue and express our disagreement in a vote or an explanation of vote, but the Secretariat has a role to play and it has fulfilled that role.

Although the High Representative is always welcome to the Committee, we have to ask: why is he coming? Is it for consultations? Is it to open a debate about the potential budgetary implications of these draft resolutions? In that regard, I see no reason for us to suspend action on the draft resolutions before us today. I would suggest that we move ahead with the voting, as announced in informal paper No. 4.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of South Africa on a point of order.

Mr. Wensley (South Africa): I agree with my colleague from Ecuador. I note that we are under strict timelines in the Committee. I see absolutely no reason why we cannot proceed to cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”. We have limited time available to us. We are member States. If anyone wants to address us from the Secretariat, so be it, but this is the First Committee and we need to get on with our work.

The Chair: I give the floor to the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

Mr. Rowland (United Kingdom): I take the floor to reassure those delegations that feel there is some attempt to postpone voting on cluster 1 for reasons related to the individual draft resolutions. That is certainly not the intent of this delegation. As I said quite clearly this morning, we have some concerns about the overarching

note that was distributed by the Secretariat on the use of the funds from the Conference on Disarmament. If those concerns can be addressed by the Secretariat, then we certainly would not wish to change any of the oral statements on the draft resolutions that have already been issued. We will not be able to take action on those draft resolutions until we have heard how the Secretariat will address our concerns about the use of the Conference on Disarmament's finances.

The Chair: If the representative of the United Kingdom allows, I would ask him whether he can say specifically which draft resolutions he is referring to.

Mr. Rowland (United Kingdom): In response to your question, Mr. Chair, the draft resolutions on which we would not be prepared to take action at this point are those that were listed in the note by the Secretariat yesterday evening, notably, draft resolutions A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1, A/C.1/70/L.25, A/C.1/70/L.28/Rev.1, A/C.1/70/L.36 and A/C.1/70/L.48. I would have no objection to the Committee proceeding with action on the other draft resolutions listed in A/C.1/70/CRP.4.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico on a point of order.

Mr. Sandoval Mendiola (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I am deeply concerned that the First Committee seems to be turning itself into the Fifth Committee. Frankly, as I said in my statement this morning, I understand and am grateful for the content of the note circulated by the Secretariat. The financing for draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1, introduced by my country, and for draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.28, introduced by Iran, is laid out very clearly in the note. This is not the first time that we have financed a working group with resources from the Conference on Disarmament. I do not think this is the time or place to be questioning whether that is a correct course of action or not. We do not fight the battles of the Fifth Committee in the First Committee.

What I would ask is that on every occasion that draft resolutions that do not have a programme budget implication are submitted to the Committee for consideration, we take action on them. Above all, there is no logic in spending time discussing draft resolutions that do not have programme budget implications. If the Committee starts requesting programme budget implications for every draft resolution, this becomes a theatre of the absurd. I ask with all due respect that we

proceed with the voting and that we continue to act as the First Committee, and not as the Fifth.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Guatemala on a point of order.

Ms. Arenales (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): I will be very succinct. I simply want to support the statements delivered by the representatives of Ecuador, South Africa and Mexico. We see no valid reason for suspending action on the draft resolutions before us.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of South Africa on a point of order.

Mr. Wensley (South Africa): I hope not to prolong this particular discussion, Sir, but we have been presented with your informal paper on what is going to be discussed today. We have never seen a veto exercised in the First Committee on what we will discuss or take action on — at least not in my memory. I stand to be corrected, but these are the draft resolutions in front of us and these are the draft resolutions we need to take action on, and I think we should proceed. I have no desire to hear any further explanation from the Secretariat on possible programme budget implications or whatever the case might be.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Austria on a point of order.

Mr. Gallhofer (Austria): I can also be brief. I should like to support what has already been said by colleagues from Ecuador, South Africa, Mexico and Guatemala. We have received the statements on the budgetary implications and therefore would like to proceed to the vote.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of Nigeria on a point of order.

Mr. Udedibia (Nigeria): As you can see, Mr. Chair, we are gradually slipping into another debate, which is completely outside the programme that the First Committee has scheduled for today, and possibly tomorrow, because it will inevitably affect our programme for tomorrow. I do share very much the concerns expressed by the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom. To me, he has a very legitimate concern, but at the same time the First Committee has a programme that it has worked out for itself and a timeline in which it prepares to conclude its work tomorrow.

As has been rightly observed by a number of delegations, the issue of budgets in the United Nations

system is the responsibility of the Fifth Committee, and we have a duty to respect that. However, we can perhaps accommodate the concerns of the two sides on this issue by going ahead with our work and voting on the outstanding items and then calling the High Representative when the five outstanding issues that have programme budget implications that the United Kingdom mentioned — draft resolutions A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1, A/C.1/70/L.25, A/C.1/70/L.28, A/C.1/70/L.36 and A/C.1/70/L.48 — are to be discussed. But for those that do not have programme budget implications we should just go ahead and take action on those draft resolutions.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of the United States on a point of order.

Ms. Crittenberger (United States of America): It is certainly not my intention to prolong this discussion, but, having initiated the request earlier this morning on a point of order to discuss the note we received early this morning from the Secretariat, I wanted to come back to the issue. At that time, we asked for discussion prior to commencing action on any draft resolution this morning, because we hoped we could resolve it early on and then move on expeditiously to adopt our draft resolutions. At your request and assurance, Sir, that there would be an informal discussion before we consider cluster 1, we agreed to proceed with action.

I just want to confirm the comments made by the Ambassador of the United Kingdom that there is certainly no intent on our part to have this discussion impact on the substance of the draft resolutions. Rather, it is an attempt to discuss the note we received in order to codify the understandings that I think we reached yesterday in our informal discussions with High Representative Kim Won-soo. During that discussion, we talked about where monies could come from to fund the issues addressed in the five draft resolutions that we have already cited, and the discussion revolved around using unspent Conference on Disarmament funds and entitlements.

Unfortunately, that is not clear in the note we have before us. Our concern is that the Conference on Disarmament, if it by a miracle does get to work next year and has some ad hoc committees and is negotiating, might need its money. In that case, those funds might not be available, although then again they might. We would like to see it reflected in the note that we are talking about unspent Conference on Disarmament funds. We would also like to see it reflected that this

is not a precedent. I understand that if the monies are available they should be put to use, but at the same time I do not think we can assume that Conference on Disarmament monies should always be drawn upon in this way.

Our desire is simply to reflect these concerns in the note by the Secretariat and have it consequently clarify the oral statements that apparently were released this morning, at least after my delegation came across the street.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of Ecuador on a point of order.

Mr. Luque Márquez (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): First, I should like to provide a correction to my previous statement. Of course, there are no programme budget implications for the five draft resolutions that have already been mentioned, but there are oral statements that the Secretariat has already issued indicating that there are no programme budget implications. I apologize for the error. There are no programme budget implications. It is the Secretariat that has the mandate to carry out this task; it is not up to the Committee to discuss it. In that regard, I have several questions of a strictly procedural nature.

As was just indicated by the representative of South Africa, it is the tradition in the First Committee that a country that is not a sponsor may request that we defer a vote or suspend action on a draft resolution that is already on the table. Mr. Chair, could you tell me what rule of procedure allows this? Is today's debate on our programme of work? No, it is not. My delegation could here and now invoke rule 117 and call for a closure of the discussion and proceed to action. No country has the right of veto on any of the draft resolutions that are already on the Committee's list for adoption.

As the representative of South Africa also said, the explanation provided by the High Representative yesterday completely satisfied my delegation. I do not want to waste further time that we could be spending on action by this Committee to hear the High Representative yet again. If some delegations have difficulties with the explanation provided by the High Representative yesterday, which is their right, they can resolve those doubts bilaterally with the High Representative. This is not the moment to have this discussion. Let us end this debate.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of India on a point of order.

Mr. Varma (India): As we said in our earlier intervention this morning, we are in your hands, Mr. Chair, and will abide by what you decide is the best way forward. We do not wish to stand in the way of further action by the Committee on draft resolutions that are listed for action.

Having said that, let me say that we have a choice. Either we can begin the discussion on the note from the Secretariat now or can repeat the discussion again in the presence of the High Representative. The High Representative was kind enough to come to us yesterday to explain how he saw the situation, and we thought we had an understanding yesterday of how the Committee would proceed, and that understanding would be reflected in a note to be prepared by the Secretariat. The High Representative was very clear. He said that he would like to use funds from the Conference on Disarmament if those funds were available and unspent. He also very clearly said that he would want to come back to the First Committee if the proposal that he envisaged did not work out because of other developments, such as the non-availability of unspent funds in the Conference on Disarmament. All that we ask of him is to reflect that understanding fully in the note that has been prepared by the Secretariat.

As the representative of the United States rightly noted, that does not seem to be the case. So we have a choice. The High Representative came to brief us openly. We are in favour of discussing it further in the open. This did not begin on the basis of bilateral discussions; it came out in the open and we would like it to be concluded in the open. We can either start now or wait until the High Representative is with us at 12.15 p.m. We are in your hands, Mr. Chair. If you wish to start action on the draft resolutions we will be with you, or if you wish to start a discussion on the note from the Secretariat now we are with you on that.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of Morocco on a point of order.

Mr. Eloumni (Morocco): This is not an issue for the programme of work of the Committee. The Secretariat always makes oral statements on some draft resolutions. When they are clear to delegations, we go ahead with business. When a delegation has a question addressed to the Secretariat, the Secretariat has the obligation to respond to that question in front of the

Committee. If those representatives of the Secretariat in the room are not in a position to give an answer or clarification, they should seek help from a competent department of the Secretariat which should come and give appropriate answers to the questions asked. I think it is legitimate for any delegation to ask a question and to seek information from the Secretariat, which has the obligation to respond. It is as simple as that. We cannot go ahead until those questions are answered appropriately.

When it comes to time constraints and the programme of work, we ask the Secretariat about the number of draft resolutions that are left, and in the light of the time left, they should tell us whether we have enough time to consider all of them. We think we have enough time to consider all the draft resolutions that are left.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of Canada on a point of order.

Mr. Davison (Canada): I guess it has not escaped anyone that we are doing an able job of getting ourselves to 12.15 p.m., when the High Representative is supposed to show up. I congratulate the First Committee.

As one country whose draft resolutions have been caught up in this confusion over programme budget implications, we thought everything had been resolved yesterday. We did not see any problem with the statement that was issued last night, but other delegations do and we are sympathetic. There have been too many days of confusion and if that is continuing into Thursday, so be it. We would very much like to hear what the High Representative has to say. We would like the confusion to be ended and to proceed with business.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of South Africa on a point of order.

Mr. Wensley (South Africa): Perhaps I should start with the last intervention by the representative of Canada. Of course this Committee will need to decide if it wishes to hear the High Representative. Having seen communications on this particular issue, I think that we have business ahead of us. I agree with our colleague from Ecuador. I agree with our colleague from Morocco. This Committee has work to do. The Secretariat can provide us with assistance but we are not going to sit here at 12.05 p.m. to be beholden to someone who might come and brief us and perhaps offer nothing new. I do not know what we are going to hear that is new from yesterday, but that is my view

as a member State and I wish to state my view as a member State that we need to get on with our business in this Committee.

The Chair: I thank all representatives for the time pressure we all feel and the clear need for this Committee to proceed with its work. At the same time, in the light of all the statements just made, I believe that it would be prudent for us to have full clarity on the oral statements to be read out by the Secretary when we get to the action phase, so that action on all drafts will and can proceed smoothly, and also to have full clarity on the understanding reached by the end of the session yesterday.

I therefore now give the floor to the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, in particular on the point concerning the Conference on Disarmament budget raised by two delegations.

Mr. Kim Won-soo (High Representative for Disarmament Affairs): As I said yesterday, I will summarize what we intend to do as follows. For the sake of the record, I will read the prepared written statement, which will be made available to all representatives afterwards.

Requests contained in the draft resolutions A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1 contained a request to convene 30 meetings of the open-ended working group in Geneva and submit four reports in 2016; A/C.1/70/L.25 contained a request to submit one report in 2016; A/C.1/70/L.28/Rev.1 contained a request to convene 80 meetings of the open-ended working groups in New York and submit 16 reports during the biennium 2016-2017; A/C.1/70/L.36 contained a request to submit one report in 2016; and, lastly, A/C.1/70/L.14 contained a request to submit one report in 2017.

Additional requirements emanating from the aforementioned draft resolutions for meetings and documentation services would not arise on the understanding that these requirements would be met from the unused entitlements for the Conference on Disarmament. The activities of the Conference on Disarmament should have priority, and its work shall not be impacted by the activities called for under the above draft resolutions. This note serves to qualify the understandings of the oral statements issued in respect of the aforementioned draft resolutions. Furthermore, nothing in this note shall constitute a precedent.

The Chair: In view of the discussion we have just had, it is my intention to now proceed, as soon as convenient to the Committee, to the action phase on cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons", as mentioned in the informal paper on the desks of delegations.

I give the floor to the representative of Mexico on a point of order.

Mr. Sandoval Mendiola (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to thank Mr. Kim Won-soo above all for the very succinct message that he has just shared with us, given that many delegations are eager to begin action on the draft resolutions. I should also like to thank you, Mr. Chair, and the excellent way in which you have carried forward the work of the First Committee. You have prioritized the successful management of our work and the timely conclusion of our work. The clock is ticking.

I should like to thank Mr. Kim Won-soo for the content of his note, which precisely reflects what my delegation was hoping to hear from the Secretariat, namely, that it takes existing precedents into account and that we receive clear and categorical responses, as the case requires. I thank Mr. Kim Won-soo for this excellent note. If anybody has a concern, they should address it to the Fifth Committee.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

Mr. Rowland (United Kingdom): I just wish to say that I am very satisfied with what has been offered.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of India on a point of order.

Mr. Varma (India): Since you have given me the floor, Sir, I will use it very briefly just to thank the High Representative. He has just demonstrated to us that he has great value, not just from his post but from his efforts yesterday and today. What he read out just now on record is something that the Indian delegation can fully support. It is consistent also with the content of our discussion last evening, and we would like to thank the High Representative for all his efforts. His presence here has dropped the temperature from deep summer to pleasant autumn already.

The Chair: The Committee will now turn to informal paper No. 4, beginning with cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons".

I now give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons".

Ms. Guitton (France) (*spoke in French*): I am providing this explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations", on behalf of the People's Republic of China, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and France.

As nuclear-weapon States as defined by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), our five countries reaffirm the shared goal of nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament, in accordance with the preamble and article VI of the NPT. In this regard, we remain steadfast in our commitment to seeking a safer world for all and achieving a world without nuclear weapons.

We continue to pursue progressive and concrete steps towards that end in a way that promotes international stability, peace and security, and on the basis of the principle of increased and undiminished security for all. An instrument, such as a convention of prohibition, that does not enjoy the support and participation of the nuclear-weapon States would not eliminate nuclear weapons, but would undermine the NPT regime, which is indispensable to the maintenance of international peace and security.

Significant achievements have already been made within this framework. An incremental, step-by-step approach is the only practical option for making progress towards nuclear disarmament, taking into account all factors that could affect global strategic security and stability. All States can help fulfil this goal by creating the necessary security environment by resolving regional tensions, addressing proliferation challenges head on, promoting collective security and making progress in all areas of arms control and disarmament.

The NPT and the existing machinery, as defined in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2), have proved to be a solid framework to advance nuclear disarmament and provide every opportunity to launch a constructive and mutually respectful dialogue. However, we remain open to other channels of discussion, not excluding an appropriately mandated open-ended working group, provided that they are

conducive to a constructive dialogue. Productive results can be ensured only through a consensus-based approach. To ensure that such an approach is genuinely inclusive and fully anchored in the security context, States must agree in advance on the key parameters of the process ahead.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1 lacks all those vital components, which would guarantee meaningful cooperation and a productive outcome of concerted collective effort. The draft resolution attempts to promote nuclear disarmament while ignoring security considerations. We do not believe that such an approach can effectively lead to concrete progress. Our five States, like many others represented here, are concerned with this divisive approach, which in no way brings the international community closer to nuclear disarmament.

For these reasons our five countries will vote against this draft resolution, while reaffirming our commitment to pursuing our individual and collective efforts, including in the framework of the P-5 process, to advance nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): In 1978, in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2), the General Assembly affirmed that the immediate goal in the area of disarmament was the elimination of the threat of nuclear weapons and unanimously accorded the highest priority to effective measures of nuclear disarmament.

Nearly 40 years later, there are still thousands of nuclear weapons that threaten the annihilation of humankind, intentionally or by accident. The objective of the elimination of the nuclear threat appears as far away as it was then, and even further because nuclear-weapon States, instead of complying with their legally binding nuclear-disarmament obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), have mostly taken the opposite direction and worked towards upgrading their stockpiles and developing newer and more effective nuclear warheads. The state of affairs in respect of the implementation of nuclear-disarmament commitments can be best characterized as a complete lack of progress.

Dissatisfaction with this situation among non-nuclear-weapon States has reached an unprecedented level. Widespread dissatisfaction voiced at the General Assembly high-level meeting

on nuclear disarmament in 2013, the Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons in 2014, and the 2015 NPT Review Conference bear strong testimony to the deep frustration of the international community and the non-nuclear-weapon States with the consequences of the existing approach of nuclear-weapon States towards nuclear disarmament.

Under these circumstances, at this session of the Committee two draft resolutions — A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1 and A/C.1/70/L.28/Rev.1 — have been submitted by the non-nuclear-weapon States with the aim of creating a momentum to advance the objective of nuclear disarmament through the establishment of two open-ended working groups, one in Geneva and one in New York, with almost similar mandates but operating under different working methods. These two draft resolutions demonstrate that there is a strong feeling and interest among non-nuclear-weapon States for breaking the current impasse and the status quo in the field of nuclear disarmament.

In this context, the Islamic Republic of Iran has always determined to engage actively in all international diplomatic and legal efforts towards nuclear disarmament. To this end, my delegation submitted draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.28/Rev.1, entitled “Effective measures on nuclear disarmament”. Allow me briefly to outline the rationale for proposing draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.28/Rev.1.

As the gap between the nominal commitment to nuclear disarmament and implementation thereof is becoming wider, the gap between the positions of nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States is also growing wider and deeper than ever. Mistrust between nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States is dominant in all relevant meetings, let alone the increasing mistrust between nuclear-weapon States themselves. If that trend remains unaddressed, it could have extensive ramifications for the NPT, which is the foundation of the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime. It is imperative to work hard in order to bridge the gap and to try to rebuild trust among NPT member States for the sake of upholding the credibility of the Treaty.

Undoubtedly the most effective solution is the systematic and progressive implementation of nuclear-disarmament obligations, the commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament and the conclusion of an agreement or agreements on

nuclear disarmament. That requires firm political determination. However, that is not happening. In these conditions, we need to hold serious and sustained discussions in an inclusive and results-oriented manner on what other legal instruments and provisions are required to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons. This is a step that in any case we need to take either now or in the near future.

In the aftermath of the failure of the NPT Review Conference, we believe that there exists a unique opportunity for conducting such a focused and serious discussion among all States Members of the United Nations to identify, elaborate and recommend effective measures on nuclear disarmament, including legal provisions that are required to achieve and maintain a world free of nuclear weapons. For this reason, four sessions of 10 working days each have been envisaged for the open-ended working group to be established by draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.28/Rev.1. This means 40 days of extensive discussion and elaboration of recommendations within two years in New York on effective measures on nuclear disarmament.

Now let me turn to the reason why draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.28/Rev.1 offers a consensus-based approach. As underlined in paragraph 28 of the Final Document of the first special session, nuclear-weapon States have the primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament and it is therefore important to secure their active participation in any nuclear-disarmament endeavour, particularly when it comes to negotiations and dialogue. This important point justifies the need for a consensus-based approach. From the beginning of this session and during all informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.28/Rev.1, we have consistently stated that the logic of this consensus-based approach is to secure the active participation of nuclear-weapon States in the process.

Regrettably, at this stage of the work of the Committee, after listening to the statement made by the representative of France on behalf of the five permanent members of the Security Council, it is evident that nuclear-weapon States are not willing at all to commit themselves even to a consensus-based and inclusive approach. In the absence of such willingness, which is essential to having a meaningful and comprehensive discussion on nuclear disarmament in the framework of the United Nations, there will be no justification for keeping this proposal on the table. Therefore my delegation, after informing the sponsors of the draft

resolution, has decided to withdraw its proposal contained in A/C.1/70/L.28/Rev.1 from the agenda of the Committee, in accordance with rule 80 of the rules of procedure.

Mr. Wensley (South Africa): I do not think that either you, Mr. Chair, or I expected me to take the floor so much today, but I am taking the floor again at this point to seek clarification on the first point made by the representative of France, which sounded to me more like an explanation of vote than a statement of a general nature. Be that as it may, she may come back and repeat that statement at some point.

I now take off my national hat and I have the honour on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition — Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand and my own delegation, South Africa — to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.41/Rev.1, entitled “Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments”. Based on feedback and suggestions received from a few delegations, the New Agenda Coalition decided to issue a revised text of its draft resolution in an effort to accommodate all legitimate concerns. These include the reformulation of one preambular paragraph dealing with the context under which the United Nations was established 70 years ago, the preambular paragraph dealing with the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as well as amendments to paragraphs 2, 3 and 8.

As in the past, the New Agenda Coalition draft resolution seeks to uphold previous commitments and obligations on nuclear disarmament under article VI of the NPT. Beyond calling for the accelerated implementation of the agreements reached at the 1995, 2000 and 2010 NPT Review Conferences without exception, the draft resolution also urges States to explore options and support efforts to identify, elaborate and negotiate legally binding effective measures in the fulfilment of article VI of the NPT. We encourage all States to show their commitment to nuclear disarmament by supporting this draft resolution.

Mr. Duarte (Brazil): The Committee is about to take action on an important set of draft resolutions under the nuclear cluster, and Brazil is a sponsor of three of them: draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.41/Rev.1, which was just introduced, A/C.1/70/L.35 and A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1. Other draft resolutions are also to be considered under this cluster, and we highlight in particular the initiative

presented by Kazakhstan, “Universal Declaration on the Achievement of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World”, which seizes the opportunity of the seventieth anniversary of the United Nations to further the goal of nuclear disarmament.

Let me also stress that the wide variety of measures proposed by the texts we are about to vote on reflects the legitimate and paramount interest of Member States in the promotion of nuclear disarmament and their determination to pursue all avenues towards achieving that goal.

Mr. Abdrakhmanov (Kazakhstan): I should like to address the Committee with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.52/Rev.1, entitled “Universal Declaration on the Achievement of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World”.

Ever since Kazakhstan closed down the nuclear test site at Semipalatinsk in 1991 and then gave up its nuclear arsenal, the fourth largest in the world, it has been striving ceaselessly to work for a world free of nuclear weapons. It has undertaken many different measures towards nuclear disarmament within the country, in the region and globally. At the country level, we collaborated closely with the United States and Russia for the dismantling and safe transport of our nuclear arsenal, as well as other initiatives that we have launched. At the regional level, we were instrumental, along with other countries of the region, in establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia, and at the global level we have contributed to many undertakings of the international community. We therefore have the moral right and responsibility, I believe, for the future of peace and security, and now we are working on positive measures that are exemplary illustrations of nuclear disarmament.

The idea of the universal declaration on the achievement of a nuclear-weapon-free world was conceived in April 2010 at the first Nuclear Security Summit in Washington, D.C. Since then, for nearly four years we have been working with Member States with different stances in a very inclusive manner on a text that would be acceptable to all, harmonizing and balancing all the perspectives from nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States, and Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) States and non-NPT States. We have tried to see the red lines stipulated by all sides and worked multidimensionally and cross-dimensionally with all sets of countries, taking infinite pains to include something for everyone.

The concerns of time frames versus phased disarmament, and convention versus some kind of legal framework and their appropriate timing, the catastrophic consequences of nuclear weapons and violations in their use are all considered in one document, and if one reads with an open mind it contains elements that are favourable to nuclear-possessor States and non-possessor States.

It has not been an easy task and yet we have managed to craft language, thanks to the understanding of countries on all sides of the spectrum, and for this we are very thankful to all members. While each country may have its national position and a certain line of stance and actions in relation to the NPT in particular or other approaches, the declaration goes beyond those specific or narrow confines and parameters. It rather embodies the greater basic principles that should lead the international community towards achieving a world free of nuclear weapons.

The declaration is unique in the sense that it takes the most controversial issues of both sides and then tries to find some middle-ground language. Every issue that was a red line for either side was discussed by bringing delegations to the negotiation or consulting table, and we have tried to craft language that would have elements of the two major opposing and contrary views so that all perspectives were contained in it, that is, whether the use of nuclear weapons would be in contravention of the spirit of the United Nations Charter, whether it would be a violation of humanitarian law or not, and whether the consequences would be catastrophic or not. Even the question of timelines or step-by-step approaches has resulted in compromise language meaning an agreed time phase, which means disarmament would occur when all sides concurred on it.

For my country, Kazakhstan, it is a question not of “either/or” — causing more rifts, which we have seen since the 2015 NPT Review Conference — but rather of diplomatically negotiating with all. We have called on the humanitarian proponents to see the views of others and likewise put equal pressure on the nuclear-possessing States to live by their obligations. For Kazakhstan, again it is not “either/or” or “them versus us”, but rather “we the people of the United Nations”.

While we are one of the strongest advocates of the path to zero, we understand the position of the five permanent members of the Security Council (P-5) and are engaged in constructive dialogue with them. Just

to prove it, permit me to cite the various high-level meetings that my President, Nursultan Nazarbayev, has had with counterparts from the P-5 countries during these past weeks and days. On 29 September he met President Obama here during the general debate. In mid-October, he met with President Putin in Astana. Two weeks ago, he met with President Xi Jinping of China, in Astana. A couple of days ago, he had a long discussion in London with Prime Minister David Cameron, and today he is supposed to meet with President François Hollande in Paris. I mention only the P-5, but needless to say there is dialogue with other world leaders. Each of these bilateral meetings had nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation high on the agenda, and the time and effort invested in the declaration reflects the same commitment here in New York, with all delegations embodying the spirit of true, sincere and equal partnership with one and all.

In conclusion, let me mention that we believe that the universal declaration is of the utmost importance to the international community, as it is aligned with the primary objective of the United Nations to promote peace, security and development, and will bring all countries together over time we are confident. So we call it “universal” not because it can be measured in the number of votes and the extent of the majority, but because it enshrines our common oneness. I thank all 34 sponsors so far, and we call on other delegations to sponsor and support this unique declaration, which is an expression of our fundamental vision.

Mr. Mugimba (Uganda): Uganda takes the floor to make general comments regarding draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.52/Rev.1, entitled “Universal Declaration on the Achievement of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World”. We need to renew our pledge made 70 years ago of a nuclear-weapon-free world, and that is why Uganda has co-sponsored the declaration.

We recently celebrated the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. The Assembly proclaimed the Day to raise awareness of the threat of nuclear weapons and to mobilize international efforts towards achieving our collective goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world. Nuclear weapons have the destructive capacity to pose a threat to the survival of humanity. As long as they continue to exist, the threat to humankind will remain. This, as well as the perceived political value and prestige attached to these weapons, are further factors that encourage proliferation and non-compliance with international obligations.

Moreover, it is of great concern that even after the end of the Cold War the threat of nuclear annihilation remains part of the twenty-first century international security environment. With the threat of climate change, we do not need more devastation from nuclear weapons. While in previous sessions we focused on nuclear-weapon-free zones, the declaration galvanizes momentum towards achieving the ultimate goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world.

Today the international community should unite again through the declaration. Africa is a nuclear-weapon-free zone through the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty, so Uganda supports the Declaration. It is indeed not logical that a few Member States should acquire nuclear weapons and others should not. That has been the very cause of others acquiring these weapons and precipitating an arms race. Action lead to reaction and reaction leads to counter-reaction.

Both the act of reducing or eliminating nuclear weapons and the end state of a nuclear-weapon-free world in which nuclear weapons are completely eliminated are no doubt more imminent than before. In Africa, we are interested in nuclear energy. All the rivers in Africa can generate only about 300 megawatts of hydropower. By 2020, there will be approximately 1.3 billion people in Africa. We therefore need nuclear energy unless it is scientifically proven that Africans do not need electricity. The total elimination of nuclear weapons is a shared responsibility, and this body should play a vital role in achieving this objective. We should therefore recommit to make nuclear weapons history and focus only on nuclear energy.

Ms. Sarfraz (Malaysia): On the biennial draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.58, entitled “Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)”, my delegation wishes to highlight that, in agreement with sponsors of the draft resolution, we would like to make an oral revision to the fourth preambular paragraph of the text of the draft resolution. The technical update is in our effort to be consistent with agreed language appearing in resolutions relating to nuclear-weapon-free zones being introduced at this Committee.

The fourth preambular paragraph will now read as follows:

“Welcoming the convening by Indonesia of the third Conference of States Parties and Signatories

to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia on 24 April 2015”.

Malaysia and the sponsors of this draft resolution extend their collective gratitude to all Member States for their continued appreciation and unwavering support to us, including by assisting us to move this draft resolution forward.

Mr. Eloumni (Morocco): Morocco would like to add its name to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.58, entitled “Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)”.

Mr. Otto (Palau): We wish to offer the following explanation of our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.52/Rev.1. Palau, as a sponsor, will vote in favour of the draft resolution, entitled “Universal Declaration on the Achievement of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World”.

Palau is a country that does not have an army. Palau does not manufacture or import arms and weapons. Therefore, it is possible to successfully lead a peaceful society under the rule of law without the need for weapons. Palau is strongly committed to make the world, and more specifically the Pacific region, a society free of nuclear weapons.

This draft resolution and its declaration advance practical steps towards the moral demand for an urgent nuclear disarmament to prevent the unjustifiable suffering and humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons to our peoples and future generations. Achieving a nuclear-weapon-free world requires the leadership and bold action of all. We understand that this is a process that is challenging and demands a comprehensive timetable. It is also imperative that traditional positions and silos find points of convergence to enable them to act together by consensus. As part of that consensus-building, the draft resolution can be taken as a reference to move forward.

Finally, as we move to implementation of the ambitious 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which we adopted in September (see resolution 70/1), we will need all the resources we can gather to strengthen the means of implementation to truly transform the world. Therefore we agree with the call for the need to invest resources to strengthen peace and security, sustainable development, and lift lives of millions of people out of poverty. I commend the delegations of Kazakhstan and other partners for putting this draft

resolution forward and for their leadership in this important matter.

The Chair: The representative of France has asked to speak for a second time. I would ask her to be succinct.

Ms. Guitton (France) (*spoke in French*): I shall be very brief. I have asked to take the floor to follow up on the statement made by the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and in order to clarify two points.

First, the explanation of vote was made, on behalf of the five permanent members of the Security Council (P-5), exclusively with respect to A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1. Furthermore, I will read out — in English, so as to prevent any misunderstanding — the passage devoted to the open-ended working group from the explanation of vote I made earlier on behalf of the P-5.

(*spoke in English*)

“We remain open to other channels of discussion, not excluding an appropriately mandated open-ended working group, provided that they are conducive to a constructive dialogue. Productive results can be ensured only through a consensus-based approach. To ensure that such an approach is genuinely inclusive and fully anchored in the security context, States must agree in advance on the key parameters of the process ahead.”

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker on general statements.

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

Mr. Gallhofer (Austria): I am taking the floor to explain Austria’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.52/Rev.1. It is regrettable, though not surprising given the obviously divergent views that exist on many key issues related to nuclear disarmament, that it is not possible to adopt a strong and genuinely universal declaration on nuclear disarmament. We highly appreciate the fact that, in spite of this, Kazakhstan has tried to overcome these differences and through extensive efforts to consult with all delegations has produced the draft before us.

These efforts have paid off and the delegation of Kazakhstan has produced a draft resolution and Declaration that contains many good elements and

strong calls for action. We very much share Kazakhstan’s strong and long-standing commitment to nuclear disarmament and a world without nuclear weapons and therefore have decided to support the draft resolution.

Mr. Kang Myong Chol (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea would like to deliver an explanation of its position before the voting with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.41/Rev.1, entitled “Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments”.

My delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.41/Rev.1 again this year because paragraph 14 fails to achieve fairness and balance by singling out the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea to fulfil its commitments under the Six-Party Talks agreement. In light of the 2005 Joint Statement issued at the Six-Party Talks, each party has an equal share of commitments and obligations, and all six parties agreed to take coordinated steps on the principle of word for word, action for action.

Especially important here are the commitments of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and the United States to respecting each other’s sovereignty and existing peacefully together. The United States, however, refuses to recognize the sovereignty of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. It continues to threaten the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea with nuclear weapons. The nuclear threats posed by the United States to the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea are by no means abstract but are physical, and they leave the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea with no option but to further strengthen its nuclear deterrent. The grave reality on the Korean peninsula shows who is to blame for the setback to the nuclear-disarmament process.

My delegation’s negative vote on this draft resolution, however, should not be construed as casting a shadow over its readiness to work with others to achieve global denuclearization. As my delegation reiterated its position earlier, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea aligns itself with the Non-Aligned Movement’s principled position on nuclear disarmament, which remains the highest priority.

Mr. Ammar (Pakistan): I have requested the floor for the purpose of an explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.25, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for

nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices". In line with our consistent and clear position on this issue, my delegation will vote against this draft resolution this year. We voted against a similar resolution in 2012, which proposed the establishment of a group of governmental experts on a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT).

Pakistan continues to believe that changing the forum or format will not overcome the fundamental obstructions in regard to the issue of an FMCT. The establishment of the Group of Governmental Experts on an FMCT was therefore an ill-conceived move. The Group of Governmental Experts would simply duplicate the work of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in a non-inclusive body, without bringing any added value to this issue.

Pakistan cannot and will not support moves that undermine the CD's role through General Assembly-led, non-universal processes that are divisive and not agreed by consensus. The group of governmental experts did not function under a mandate of the CD. The members of the Group of Governmental Experts cannot, either individually or collectively, arrogate to themselves the right to decide how the CD should consider the issue of fissile material. Such measures are contrary to the recognized international position adopted by consensus that the CD is the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum.

The discussion mandate assigned to the Group of Governmental Experts could easily have been fulfilled in the CD. This fact was vividly demonstrated during the informal discussions on the issue of a ban on the production of fissile material in the CD held under the schedule of activities in June last year. These informal discussions were substantive and held in a representative body with the participation of all stakeholders, thereby having greater relevance and legitimacy. Pakistan therefore is not in a position to accept any conclusions or recommendations produced by that group of governmental experts, including the assertion that the report can form the basis for further consideration of the FMCT issue by the CD.

The Group of Governmental Experts experiment failed to produce any consensus recommendation with any substance. Contrary to what the proponents of an FMCT like to argue, fundamental differences continue to exist on vital issues of the proposed treaty, such as definitions, scope, stocks, verifications and entry into

force. To make progress in the CD it is essential to take into account and address the security concerns of all States. No treaty has ever been agreed, nor will be, by the negotiating States unless their legitimate security concerns are accommodated. The discriminatory nuclear cooperation policies pursued by some major Powers have exacerbated insecurities and accentuated asymmetry in fissile material stocks in South Asia.

It is for these reasons that Pakistan has been obliged to take a clear position on an FMCT. No country can be expected to compromise its fundamental security interests for an instrument that is cost-free for all other concerned countries.

Mr. Primasto (Indonesia): I am taking the floor to explain Indonesia's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.25, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices". Indonesia supports all efforts and initiatives designed to make concrete progress in the field of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation including, but not limited to, the negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament of a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices.

In the context of the Conference on Disarmament, however, Indonesia has urged and will continue to urge the Conference to agree on and implement a balanced and comprehensive programme of work, paying particular attention to the urgent commencement of negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-weapons convention which prohibits the possession, development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer and use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and regulates the destruction of such weapons.

Based on the aforementioned points, Indonesia will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.25.

Ms. Ramos (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Cuba will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.52/Rev.1, entitled "Universal Declaration on the Achievement of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World". This is a new initiative submitted at this meeting by the representative of Kazakhstan.

In Cuba's opinion, this is an innovative and timely proposal that will contribute to the efforts being undertaken by the vast majority of the international community to achieve the complete prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons in the

shortest possible time frame. As is stated in the text, any use of nuclear weapons, in addition to having catastrophic consequences for humankind, would be in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations, a violation of international law and a war crime. The draft proposes various practical actions that we believe to be appropriate to moving us closer to nuclear disarmament.

The universal declaration that would be formally adopted, as we hope it will be, does not entirely reflect the position of Cuba. In our opinion, the text suffers from various limitations and shortcomings. Despite that, we believe that the overall balance of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.52/Rev.1 is positive, and the Cuban delegation will support it.

Mr. McConville (Australia): I shall be brief. I speak in relation to an explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.52/Rev.1, entitled “Universal Declaration on the Achievement of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World”. I speak on behalf of Portugal, Bulgaria, Romania, Greece, Finland and my own country, Australia.

We support the global push to achieve a world without nuclear weapons. We also commend the draft resolution’s strong support for the crucial role of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in achieving nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Nevertheless, there are problematic references in the declaration itself that we cannot agree with, notably paragraph 4 and the conclusions it draws in relation to the application of international law. It is for this reason that we will be abstaining in the voting on this draft resolution.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”, as reflected in informal paper No. 4.

We will first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.4/Rev.1, entitled “2020 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.4/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Algeria. The sponsor of the draft resolution is named in document A/C.1/70/L.4/Rev.1. In addition, the following oral statement is made in

accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.4/Rev.1, the General Assembly would take note of the decision of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, following appropriate consultations, to hold the first session of the Preparatory Committee in Vienna from 2 to 12 May 2017; and request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, as may be required, for the 2020 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee.

All costs related to the 2020 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee shall be met in accordance with arrangements made by the parties to the Treaty. Consequently, the request that the Secretary-General render the necessary assistance and provide such services as may be required for the 2020 Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee would not entail any financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations.

Following established practice, the Secretariat will prepare cost estimates for the 2020 Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee for the approval of the States parties. It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties under their respective legal instruments are to be financed by the States parties. These activities would be undertaken by the Secretariat after sufficient funding is received in advance.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.4/Rev.1 would not give rise to financial implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada,

Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, 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:

India, Israel, Pakistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.4/Rev.1 was adopted by 175 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 9th meeting, on 19 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.6. In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1, the General Assembly would reaffirm the urgency of securing substantive progress in multilateral nuclear-disarmament negotiations, and to this end decide to convene an open-ended working group to substantively address the concrete effective legal measures, legal provisions and norms that will need to be concluded to attain and maintain a world without nuclear weapons; and decide that the open-ended working group shall also substantively address recommendations on other measures that could contribute to taking forward multilateral nuclear-disarmament negotiations, including but not limited to: transparency measures related to the risks associated with existing nuclear weapons; measures to reduce and eliminate the risk of accidental, mistaken, unauthorized or intentional nuclear-weapon detonations; and additional measures to increase awareness and understanding of the complexity of and interrelationship between the wide range of humanitarian consequences that would result from any nuclear detonation.

The General Assembly would further decide that the open-ended working group shall convene in Geneva, in 2016, as a subsidiary body of the General Assembly and under its rules of procedure, for up to 15 working days, within available time frames, with the participation and contribution of international organizations and civil-society representatives, in accordance with established practice, and shall hold its organizational session as soon as possible; decide that the open-ended working group shall submit a report on its substantive work and agreed recommendations to the General Assembly at its seventy-first session, which will assess progress made, taking into account developments in other relevant forums; and request the Secretary-General to provide, within available resources, the support necessary to convene the open-ended working group and to transmit the report of the working group to the Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission and to

the international conference foreseen in paragraph 6 of resolution 68/32.

Pursuant to the requests contained in paragraphs 2, 3, 5 and 8, it is envisaged that the open-ended working group would hold meetings in Geneva in 2016 for up to 15 working days for a total of 30 meetings, one meeting in the morning and one in the afternoon, with interpretation in all six languages. The Conference on Disarmament has an entitlement of 190 meetings with interpretation services per biennium. Additional requirements for meeting services would not arise on the understanding that the aforementioned 30 meetings would be met from the entitlement of the Conference on Disarmament, and the meetings would not be convened in parallel with meetings of the Conference on Disarmament. The dates of the meetings would be decided in consultation with the Conference management in Geneva. With regard to the organizational session referenced in paragraph 5, this would not require any interpretation services, as confirmed by the Weapons of Mass Destruction Branch of the Office for Disarmament Affairs, and as such would not entail additional requirements for meeting services.

The request for documentation contained in paragraphs 7 and 8 would entail three in-session documents totalling 13,250 words, in all six languages, and one post-session document, totalling 8,500 words, in all six languages in 2016. The Conference on Disarmament has an entitlement of 30 reports per biennium for its informal plenary meetings and other informal meetings. Additional requirements for documentation services would not arise on the understanding that the four documents would be met from the entitlement of the Conference on Disarmament.

With regard to the reference “within available resources” contained in paragraph 8, the attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 68/246 of 27 December 2013, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with the responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters; and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1 would not give rise to any

programme budget implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017. It should be noted that if the resources allocated to the Conference on Disarmament are not available, the Secretariat will appraise the situation and advise member States as appropriate.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

China, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Hungary, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Russian

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

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.13/Rev.1 was adopted by 135 votes to 12, with 33 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.25, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.25 was introduced by the representative of Canada at the Committee’s 10th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is named in document A/C.1/70/L.25. In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.25, the General Assembly would call upon the Secretary-General, building on the report contained in document A/68/154 and Add.1, to seek the views of Member States on the report of the Group of Governmental Experts and to submit a report on the subject to the General Assembly at its seventy-first session.

The request for documentation contained in paragraph 3 would entail one pre-session document, totalling 8,500 words, in all six languages in 2016. The Conference on Disarmament has an entitlement of 30 reports per biennium for its informal plenary meetings and other informal meetings. Additional requirements for documentation services would not arise on the understanding that the document would be met from the entitlement of the Conference on Disarmament.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.25 would not give rise to any programme

budget implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017. It should be noted that if the resources allocated to the Conference on Disarmament are not available, the Secretariat will appraise the situation and advise member States as appropriate.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

Pakistan

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.25 was adopted by 175 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.35, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.35 was introduced by the representative of New Zealand, also on behalf of Brazil, at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.35 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.6.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Israel

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.35 was adopted by 174 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.41/Rev.1, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.41/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of South Africa, on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition, at the Committee's 9th meeting, on 19 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.41/Rev.1 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.6.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 13. I shall put this paragraph to the vote first.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, 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, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Bhutan, France, Hungary, Palau, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 13 was retained by 163 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.41/Rev.1, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, 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, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.41/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 135 votes to 7, with 38 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.52/Rev.1, entitled "Universal Declaration on the Achievement of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.52/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Kazakhstan at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.52/Rev.1 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.6. In addition, Fiji, Mauritania and Uruguay have become sponsors. In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.52/Rev.1, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its seventy-third session a report on the implementation of the universal declaration on the achievement of a nuclear-weapon-free world. It is anticipated that the request contained in operative paragraph 3 will constitute an addition to the documentation workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management of one document of 8,500 words, to be issued in all six languages. This would entail additional requirements in the amount of \$50,900 for documentation services in 2018.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.52/Rev.1, the additional

resource requirements of \$50,900 which would arise for 2018 under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and conference management, will be included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Poland, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China, Croatia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.52/Rev.1 was adopted by 131 votes to 22, with 28 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.58, entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.58 was introduced by the representative of Malaysia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the States parties to the Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-

Weapon-Free Zone, at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 30 October, and has just been orally revised.

As a result of the oral revision, the fourth preambular paragraph will now read:

"Welcoming the convening by Indonesia of the third Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia on 24 April 2015".

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/70/L.58 and A/C.1/70/CRP.4/Rev.6. In addition, Jamaica and Morocco have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.58, as orally revised, have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.58, as orally revised, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.