



General Assembly

Seventy-fourth session

First Committee

26th meeting

Thursday, 7 November 2019, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Llorentty Solíz (Bolivia (Plurinational State of))

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Agenda items 89 to 105 (continued)

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

The Chair: This afternoon the Committee will continue to take action on all draft resolutions and draft decisions submitted under the agenda items before it. Time permitting, thereafter we will consider the “Draft provisional programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2020”, as contained in document A/C.1/74/CRP.5.

The Committee will first take up the proposals under cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security”, contained in informal paper No.3/Rev.1. After considering all proposals in informal paper No.3/Rev.1, the Committee will take up informal paper No.4, which has been circulated electronically. Information on additional requests for votes that may have been made since the issuance of informal paper No. 3/Rev.1 and informal paper No.4 will be posted on the southern wall of the conference room, to the left of the podium.

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

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.5, entitled “Regional disarmament”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.5 was submitted by the representative of Pakistan on 5 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.5. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.5 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.7, entitled “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.7 was submitted by the representative of Pakistan on 5 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.7. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on the seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.7. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I shall first put to the vote the seventh preambular paragraph.

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>).



A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, China, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

India, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

Indonesia, North Macedonia, Zimbabwe

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 149 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of El Salvador, Paraguay, Serbia and Turkey informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, China, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa,

Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 107 votes to 1, with 46 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of El Salvador, Haiti, Paraguay, Serbia and Turkey 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.1/74/L.7, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Comoros, 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, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste,

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

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.7, as a whole, was adopted by 168 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Benin, El Salvador, Haiti, Mauritius, Paraguay and Turkey 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.1/74/L.8, "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context".

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.8 was submitted by the representative of Pakistan on 5 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.8. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.8 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.9, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.9 was submitted by the representative of Algeria on 4 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.9. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE

portal of the First Committee. The Sudan has also become a sponsor.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 2 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.9. I shall put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Canada, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great

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

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 169 votes to 2.

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

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 5.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Canada, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent

and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Finland

Operative paragraph 5 was retained by 167 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Finland and Paraguay 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.1/74/L.9, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Canada, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius,

Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.9, as a whole, was adopted by 172 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.28, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.28 was submitted 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, on 15 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.28.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, 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, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia,

Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.28 was adopted by 130 votes to 3, with 44 abstentions.

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

The Chair: I now call on delegations wishing to explain their position after the voting.

Mr. Bourgel (Israel): I would like to exercise my right to deliver an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.9, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region". We voted against operative paragraphs 2 and 5 as they do not truly reflect the reality in the Middle East.

With regard to operative paragraph 2, peace in the Mediterranean region is the ultimate goal of the State of Israel, but the one-sided paragraph is misleading. There is no mention of the ongoing use of chemical weapons by the Al-Assad regime. There is no mention of the ongoing missile proliferation by the Iranian regime. There is no mention of the terror unleashed by the Iranian regime. There is no mention of the radical Islamic groups and non-State actors that terrorize the whole region, including the Mediterranean. The draft resolution legitimizes the atrocities that are perpetuated in our region, as well as dangerous proliferation.

With regard to operative paragraph 5, Israel believes that joining arms-control treaties is not an aim or goal in and of itself, because such treaties are useless if countries do not obey them or if they do not solve regional issues. Israel believes that the most important element is for the right conditions to be established, thereby creating trust and confidence, security and mutual recognition. Without those conditions, it is an illusion that is doomed to fail. Israel believes that it is time to face the reality for what it is.

Ms. Bhandari (India): I take the floor to explain India's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.7, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

India voted against draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.7 and its 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. As the world's single multilateral disarmament negotiating

forum, the Conference has a vocation of negotiating disarmament instruments of global application. The United Nations Disarmament Commission in 1993 adopted by consensus guidelines and recommendations on regional disarmament. There is therefore no need 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.

Furthermore, we believe that the security concerns of States extend beyond narrowly defined regions. Consequently, the notion of the preservation of balance in defence capabilities in the regional or subregional context is both unrealistic and unacceptable. We are therefore not convinced that conventional arms control needs to be pursued primarily in the regional and subregional contexts. In our view, it should be primarily pursued in the global context.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I take the floor to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.9, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

Iran voted in favour of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which calls for the elimination of all causes of tension in the region and for the promotion of just and lasting solutions to its persistent problems. More important, our support for that paragraph is based on its call for ensuring the withdrawal of foreign forces of occupation, respecting the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all countries of the region and the rights of peoples to self-determination, as well as for full adherence to the principle of the non-use or threat of use of force and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. Those are the basic principles of international law, and they enjoy our strong support.

My delegation also voted in favour of operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, as it calls for adherence to all the multilaterally negotiated legal instruments on disarmament and non-proliferation. Israel is the only case in point. Therefore, that is in line with repeated calls by successive Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) for Israel to accede without any delay or precondition as a non-nuclear-weapon party to the NPT.

However, my delegation did not participate in action on the draft resolution as a whole, as the draft has not factually reflected the realities in the region and

the situation in the occupied territories, including the continued killing of innocent Palestinian civilians in the occupied territories of Palestine and the imposition by the Israeli regime of the most severe blockade on the Gaza Strip.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): We would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.9.

We voted in favour of the paragraphs of the draft resolution and of the draft resolution as a whole. The overwhelming majority of delegations of States Members of the United Nations voted in its favour because we all believe that the content, legality and thrust of the draft resolution are in line with the Charter of the United Nations and international law. Nonetheless, we have reservations about the fact that the paragraphs of the draft resolution do not make reference to terrorism perpetrated by the Israeli entity in our region, its failure to comply with relevant Security Council, General Assembly and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) resolutions, its non-accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and its refusal to place all that entity's facilities under the safeguards of the IAEA.

However, we voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. It is our hope that in future the sponsors of the text will take into account the need to make clear reference to the Israeli entity's violation of all instruments. The Israeli entity practices terrorism in our region and cooperates with like-minded entities listed by the Security Council as terrorists, such as Da'esh and the Al-Nusra Front.

We believe, therefore, that there should be a direct reference to the name of that entity in the draft resolution to be submitted to the First Committee next year, given the fact that the Israeli entity does not believe in any of the texts referenced in the draft resolution. It does not believe in peace or in acceding to any international conventions related to the non-proliferation of all kinds of weapons of mass destruction.

Accordingly, we believe that reference should be made to the massacres committed by that entity and to its failure to comply with any of the relevant United Nations resolutions, let alone the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, which is the *raison d'être* for our presence here.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting on cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security”. The Committee will now turn to cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”.

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

I give the floor to the representative of Peru to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.42.

Mr. Mestanza (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): As it does every year, my delegation takes the floor to introduce, on behalf of the 33 States that make up the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.42, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean”.

It was up to my country again this year to facilitate the draft resolution on the Centre, which is headquartered in Lima. It outlines the Centre’s work covering the period from July 2018 to June 2019. We would like to highlight the important role played by the Regional Centre, as it helps the States of the region to conduct a series of initiatives and activities aimed at implementing peace and disarmament measures, as well as at their economic and social development, through the appropriate use of available resources. In that regard, the Regional Centre organized activities to provide legal, technical and policy assistance so as to help States of Latin America and the Caribbean, at their request, to implement international instruments on conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction, as well as assist them in activities that promote the role of women in disarmament initiatives, arms control and non-proliferation, in line with resolution 65/79.

Lastly, my delegation would like to thank Member States and other partners that supported the Centre’s operations and programmes with financial and in-kind contributions. We call on all countries to continue providing their generous support. Similarly, we would like to reiterate our strong support for the role of the Regional Centre in promoting United Nations activities at the regional level to foster peace, stability, security and development. For that reason, we believe that, as in previous years, we will receive the valuable support of all delegations to ensure that the draft resolution is adopted by consensus.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.61.

Mr. Gata Mavita Wa Lufuta (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*spoke in French*): The Democratic Republic of the Congo has the honour to take the floor on behalf of the Group of Central African States to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.61, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”. As members know, the draft resolution is submitted every year to First Committee to provide an overview of the Committee’s work. This is an opportunity for our subregion to make the following observations.

First, the Group of Central African States welcomes the efforts of the United Nations to promote peace and stability in the subregion, which faces considerable security challenges, marked in particular by the activities of armed groups, terrorists and mercenaries, the illicit exploitation of natural resources, poaching and wildlife trafficking. The Standing Advisory Committee has enabled the building of trust among States of the subregion and the promotion of enhanced coordination, in particular with regard to combating terrorism, trafficking in small arms and light weapons and maritime piracy. In that regard, the Group calls for capacity-building within the Standing Advisory Committee so that it can provide an adequate response to today’s many emerging challenges, such as the negative impact of climate change. Greater financial resources would also allow it to accelerate the implementation of the peace and security agenda and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in Central Africa, as the two agendas are closely linked.

Secondly, the Group reiterates the commitment of the countries of the subregion to continuing their peace efforts. The first Conference of States Parties to the Central African Convention for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons, Their Ammunition, Parts and Components That Can Be Used for Their Manufacture, Repair or Assembly — the Kinshasa Convention — highlights the commitment of States to establish lasting peace in the subregion. Therefore, the Group invites all international partners to provide financial support for the implementation of the Convention, as well as other initiatives to promote stability in the subregion of Central Africa.

The preamble of the draft resolution essentially recalls the mission of the Standing Advisory Committee and reaffirms its importance. It urges the subregion of Central Africa to implement the Libreville Declaration on the Adoption and Implementation of the Regional Strategy and Plan of Action for Combating Terrorism and the Trafficking in Small Arms and Light Weapons in Central Africa. It requests the United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa, the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa and the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001), concerning counter-terrorism, as well as the international community as a whole, to continue supporting the efforts of its member States.

While reaffirming the importance of pastoralism and transhumance for the economies of several States of the subregion, the draft resolution encourages Member States to develop mechanisms for community regulations and calls for the holding of a high-level conference to discuss issues related to pastoralism and cross-border transhumance in order to resolve increasingly recurrent tensions between nomadic herders and local communities in several countries of the subregion, which could undermine international peace and security.

Central African States will continue supporting the draft resolution. We call on all other delegations to do the same by adopting it by consensus in order to allow the Standing Advisory Committee, as an instrument of preventive diplomacy in the subregional peace and security architecture, to continue its work to promote peace and strengthen confidence-building measures.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Australia to introduce draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1

Mr. Thorne (Australia): I take the floor on behalf of Hungary and Australia, as the main sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1, entitled “2020 session of the Disarmament Commission”.

Delegations will recall the challenges we all faced in convening the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) this year. One of our key deliberative bodies on disarmament matters, an essential component of the disarmament machinery, was unable to fulfil its mandate to transmit a report to the First Committee for its consideration. It was not because of a deep division over substantive matters, but because of unresolvable organizational issues that

prevented us from having a formal exchange on matters of substance.

The First Committee and its related bodies address some of the greatest challenges facing the international community, but procedural matters prevented us from sitting down and talking to each other and, more important, from sitting down and listening to each other. That situation is unprecedented for the UNDC. Whenever international tensions were high, the membership was willing to allow the body to convene and take basic technical actions related to its operation.

As the 2018 Chair and 2019 Chair-designate, Australia and Hungary worked tirelessly in a consultative, collaborative and transparent fashion to preserve our tradition of consensus. We regret that the UNDC was unable to find its path to that consensus this year. This draft decision is the product of months of consultations with groups and interested parties. It incorporates suggestions that reflect agreed texts and represents our best prospect for preserving consensus on the importance of convening the UNDC in April next year.

When we make ourselves unable to meet, talk or listen, we make the task of finding a consensus among us that much harder. The draft amendments presented do not give us the assurance that we will meet. They make our next session conditional upon factors outside the First Committee and are based on a report the General Assembly has not yet considered. We call on all Member States to vote against the proposed amendments. We call on all Member States to adopt the decision presented by the Chair and Chair-designate in the draft decision without a vote. We have the opportunity to send a clear signal from the Committee that the disarmament machinery remains vital to our shared efforts to preserve international peace and security and that we are determined to keep the focus on our work and move forward together and discuss our common challenges in a spirit of mutual respect and partnership.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Nepal to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.23.

Mr. Thapa (Nepal): Nepal has been a strong advocate of the important role of regional disarmament in the maintenance of international peace and security. We are of the view that regional and global approaches to disarmament and non-proliferation complement each other and should be pursued simultaneously.

Regional dialogues and information exchange help confidence-building and create an environment conducive to making further progress in the area of regional peace and disarmament. In that regard, we appreciate the activities undertaken by the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific (UNRCPD) to promote regional discussions on the important disarmament agenda, including on the governmental process.

As the host country of the Regional Centre, Nepal is committed to lending its full support for an enhanced and constructive role by the UNRCPD. My delegation has the honour to introduce, on behalf of all its sponsors, draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.23, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", for the First Committee's consideration. Nepal expresses its sincere gratitude to all Member States for their valuable support and encourages them to sponsor the draft resolution, if they have not already done so. We are confident that, as in previous years, the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): More than a month has passed since the Russian delegation raised the issue about the United States implementation of its obligations under the 1947 Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations. In that time, our delegation has demonstrated a constructive approach to that exceedingly sensitive topic.

We have patiently waited for concrete steps on the part of the authorities of the United States to resolve the situation, caused by their actions, with regard to the access of Russian representatives, and that of other delegations, to United Nations events, including for participation in the work of the First Committee. We listened attentively to the views and concerns of other delegations with respect to possibly conducting the work of the First Committee and the United Nations Disarmament Commission in Vienna or Geneva. We understand all too well that, for several reasons, it is not easy for some delegations to make that decision. That is why we decided to meet halfway those delegations that generally supported our position but raised doubts about taking hasty decisions about changing the venue of the sessions of the First Committee and the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Although to date there have been no positive developments regarding the settlement of the visa issue, we have nonetheless taken the decision to adjust our position. We, unlike the authorities of the United States, in this way demonstrate a constructive approach to the artificial and, as it appears to be, intentionally created unacceptable situation surrounding the issuance of visas to foreign diplomats. We propose a gradual approach that should be supported by the participants of the First Committee, taking into account the views expressed by delegations, the consideration of this issue in the Committee on Relations with the Host Country and the Sixth Committee, as well as the assurances received from the Secretariat. That approach allows the Secretary-General and the Secretariat, based on our decision to take additional measures to resolve the visa issue, and to demonstrate through actions, and not just words, their ability to fulfil their obligations to ensure the effective and efficient work of United Nations organs, which, undoubtedly, depends upon the equal participation of all States and their delegations, without exception.

Furthermore, in accordance with our approach, technical and financial justifications will be prepared to support the option of transferring the work of the First Committee and the United Nations Disarmament Commission to Vienna or Geneva, which should subsequently, facilitate a decision on the issue, if need be. We would again like to draw attention to the fact that the visa issue is separate from that of bilateral relations between Russia and the United States, as some delegations attempt to imply. The issue is long-standing and pertains to the United States meeting its obligations to the United Nations, in accordance with the 1947 Headquarters Agreement. Since 1985, some 60 States have become victims of the United States policy of discrimination. In these circumstances, addressing the visa issue as a bilateral one is simply inappropriate.

Lastly, we are being told that the consideration of the visa issue does not fall within the purview of the First Committee. That is not the case. First of all, the list of issues considered by the First Committee includes the revitalization of the work of the General Assembly. Under that agenda item we may discuss any issue that affects the effectiveness of the work of one of the key Committees of the General Assembly. There can be no doubt that obstacles to the participation of foreign delegations in the work of the First Committee affect its effectiveness and performance. Secondly, during

this session we have repeatedly discussed issues such as increasing the participation of women and youth in discussions related to disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control activities. The proponents who spoke on that topic stressed that attracting women and youth would enhance, among other things, the effectiveness of the United Nations disarmament machinery. At the same time, that means that, if visas are not issued to members of delegations, visas will not be issued to women and young people, which will deal a blow to an important mechanism for ensuring international security.

Another blow is dealt when the host country of the United Nations Headquarters, through its discriminatory visa policy, attempts to influence the composition of national delegations and their participation in the work of the First Committee. The visa issue directly affects the work of our Committee, which means that we should consider the issue here at the First Committee.

The Chair: All delegations have six minutes to speak, if they so require.

The Committee will now hear from delegations wishing to explain their position before we take action on the draft proposals listed under cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

Mr. Bravaco (United States of America): I take the floor to explain my delegation's vote before the voting on the hostile amendments contained in document A/C.1/74/L.62 to draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1, entitled "2020 session of the Disarmament Commission".

It is entirely inappropriate to inject host country issues into draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1. The General Assembly allocated to the Sixth Committee the agenda item on the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. In fact, that item was debated in the Sixth Committee just yesterday. In addition, the Sixth Committee annually adopts a draft resolution specifically on the report of the Host Country Committee. The first round of informal consultations on that draft resolution were held just today. In other words, the appropriate body is working on that issue in the appropriate way.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) is a subsidiary body of the General Assembly, tasked with making consensus recommendations on arms control and disarmament matters and composed of all States Members of the United Nations. It is a

unique and special body. But it has no competency on host country issues.

It was truly unfortunate that, in April, the sponsors of document A/C.1/74/L.62 held the international community hostage in the UNDC and prevented the Commission from formally convening. In hindsight, we see that the patience exercised in April by the international community over the whole Disarmament Commission affair has led only to more hostage-taking this fall here in the First Committee. It is a sobering lesson to us all that, if aggression is acquiesced to, it begets only more aggression. We see that now, not only with a subsidiary body of General Assembly but of a Main Committee. All such aggressive behaviour is linked, and the obstructionism is spreading, with profound implications for the United Nations disarmament machinery in particular. However, the implications could not be graver, over time, for the institutional integrity of the United Nations itself.

Our delegation's fear is that, if hostile amendments such as document A/C.1/74/L.62, can be tolerated and Main Committees and subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly can be blocked or vetoed by one or more delegations from continuing their work and giving this entire body and the Commission and all of the Member States assembled here the right to be heard, it will spell the beginning of the end for the United Nations. If the United Nations fails because one or more delegations decide to inject bilateral matters into a multilateral meeting on topics on which it has no competency, we will never get it back.

I urge all delegations to vigorously oppose the hostile amendments contained in document A/C.1/74/L.62, as they are contrary to multilateralism. They will damage the United Nations Disarmament Commission and, by implication, they will damage the United Nations itself. There is an appropriate body that deals with host country issues in the appropriate way. That is where that work belongs. The Disarmament Commission needs to get on with its work and not focus on, or be interrupted by, host country issues, but instead fulfil its mandate of dealing with arms control and disarmament matters and making recommendations to the international community on the best way forward on those issues. I therefore ask members to vote against document A/C.1/74/L.62.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): This is an explanation of vote on the draft amendments contained

in document A/C.1/74/L.62, proposed by the Russian delegation, to draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1, on the 2020 session of the Disarmament Commission.

Unfortunately, what we heard with regard to the legitimate concerns expressed by a State Member of the United Nations, which has the right to participate in the meetings of the United Nations in New York, has been distorted by the delegation of the United States. All we have heard is the politicization of an issue, which is precisely a legal issue. My delegation will vote in favour of the draft amendments proposed by the Russian delegation because they are based on the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country (A/74/26).

The draft amendments refer to paragraph 165 (j), in which the Host Country Committee expresses concern regarding the non-issuance of entry visas to certain representatives of certain Member States and takes note of the statement of the United Nations Legal Counsel. In that statement, the Legal Counsel refers to the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations and the fact that the United States has the obligation to provide unrestricted access to representatives of the States Members of the United Nations.

The draft amendments also refer to paragraph 165 (p), in which the Committee encourages the Secretary-General to engage more actively in the work of the Committee, in accordance with resolution 2819 (XXVI), of 15 December 1971, with a view to ensuring the representation of the interests concerned and, in that regard, takes note of the statement of the United Nations Legal Counsel at the emergency meeting of the Committee, as set out in document A/AC.154/415. The Committee considered that, if the issues raised above were not resolved in a reasonable and finite period of time, serious consideration would be given to taking steps under section 21 of the Headquarters Agreement. Those proposed amendments and references to the report of a Committee of the United Nations are not political. They are legal and have been considered by all Members of the United Nations. The Host Committee issued a report.

I encourage delegations to consider the situation faced by the Russian delegation and that of other delegations whose members have been denied entry visas. Today it is the turn of the Russian delegation and

that of the delegations of other countries; tomorrow it might be their turn. That, for bilateral or political reasons, the United States may deny entry visas to the delegations of other Members of the United Nations is not acceptable. Diplomats at the United Nations should collectively defend their rights under the Headquarters Agreement.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): As the representative of Australia mentioned, the disarmament machinery is under pressure. The United Nations Disarmament Commission is a deliberative body that is supposed to offer recommendations to the international community on topics that are agreed upon. We all know the party that used the veto in 2008, and, in other years, to block any recommendations on nuclear disarmament. All of us prefer not to use the voting mechanism, despite the fact that the rules of procedure allow us to do so. The objective of the recommendations is to be consensual.

The representative of the United States just now attempted to portray the situation in an inverse manner. The very same delegation has been preventing the holding of meetings of the Disarmament Commission and taking the Commission hostage. The same delegation — that of the host country — prevented the start of our work this year. It violates the Headquarters Agreement between the United Nations and the United States. That is their way of allowing in whomever they want and denying whomever they do not want. Everyone should accept that, and this is how they proceed now.

As mentioned by the representative of Iran, there are certain States being currently targeted and, perhaps, in future it will be the turn of other States. The actions of the host country are based on political relations with States, and not on the Headquarters Agreement. The goal of presenting draft resolutions and amendments is only to preserve the disarmament machinery and its continued operation.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.23, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.23 was submitted by the representative of Nepal on 14 October. The

sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.23. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. India, Maldives and Singapore have also become sponsors.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.23 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.33, entitled “United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.33 was submitted by the representative of Indonesia on 15 October on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.33.

The present 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.1/74/L.33, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide all the support necessary, within existing resources, to the regional centres in carrying out their programmes of activities. The implementation of the request contained in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the proposed programme budget for 2020. The provisions contained therein would cover 10 posts — three P-5 Senior Political Affairs Officers, three P-3 Political Affairs Officers and four General Service/Local level posts — in the regional centres, as well as general operating expenses of the centres. The programme of activities of the three regional centres would also continue to be financed from extra-budgetary resources. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.33, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for 2020.

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 73/279 A, of 22 December 2018, 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 Fifth Committee in carrying out a thorough analysis and approving human and financial resources and policies, with a view to ensuring the full, effective and efficient implementation of all mandated programmes and activities and the implementation of policies in this regard.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.33 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.34, entitled “Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.34 was submitted by the representative of Indonesia on 15 October on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.34.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, 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, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the

Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

France, Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.34 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.1/74/L.38, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa".

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.38 was submitted by the representative of Nigeria on 16 October on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.38. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Equatorial Guinea, Namibia and the Niger have also become sponsors.

The present oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 4 and 11 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.38, the General Assembly would recall the undertaking by the Regional Centre to deepen its partnership with the African Union Commission in the context of the Joint United Nations-African Union Framework for Enhanced Partnership in Peace and Security, signed on 19 April 2017, as well as with African subregional organizations, and 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 request the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Regional Centre with the support necessary for greater achievements and results.

The implementation of the request in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budget for 2020.

With regard to paragraph 11, provisions under section 4, "Disarmament", of the programme budget for the biennium 2020 would cover one P-5 Senior Political Affairs Officer, one P-3 Political Affairs Officer and two General Service/Local level posts, as well as general operating expenses. The programme of activities of the Regional Centre would continue to be financed from extra-budgetary resources.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.38 would not give rise to any programme budget implications under the proposed programme budget for 2020.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.38 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.39, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.39 was submitted by the representative of Zimbabwe on 16 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/74/L.39.

The present oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.39, 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 the necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services. It is recalled that resources for the substantive and secretariat support of the Conference on Disarmament are included under section 4, “Disarmament”, and that the resources, for conference servicing are included under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management”, of the proposed programme budget for 2020.

Subject to decisions taken at the 2020 session of the Conference on Disarmament to establish its programme of work for 2020 and/or to establish any subsidiary bodies, the strengthening of all the necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services to the Conference, as requested in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, may entail additional resource requirements under the proposed programme budget for 2020. Established procedures 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.1/74/L.39 would not give rise to any programme budget implications under the proposed programme budget for 2020.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.39 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.42, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.42 was submitted by the representative of Peru on 16 October on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.42.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.42 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1, entitled “2020 session of the Disarmament Commission”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52 was submitted by the representatives of Australia and Hungary on 17 October. Subsequently, revised draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1 was submitted on 3 November. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1.

The Chair: On 4 November, the representative of the Russian Federation submitted an amendment to draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1. That amendment is contained in document A/C.1/74/L.62 and relates to the eighth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph (a) of the draft decision.

In accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee shall first take action on the amendment. A recorded vote has been requested.

I shall first put to the vote draft amendment A/C.1/74/L.62.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Angola, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cambodia, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Serbia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Draft amendment A/C.1/74/L.62 was rejected by 21 votes to 66, with 59 abstentions.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft decision have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote.

The representative of the Russian Federation has requested the floor on a point of order.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation requests that we put to the vote operative paragraphs (a) and (b) of draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1.

The Chair: Separate, recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs (a) and (b) of draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1.

I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph (a).

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Russian Federation

Abstaining:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lesotho, Mali, Nicaragua, Niger, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph (a) was retained by 133 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Mongolia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph (b).

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Russian Federation

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lesotho, Mali, Nicaragua, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph (b) was retained by 133 votes to 1, with 15 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Mongolia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.61, entitled "Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa".

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.61 was submitted by the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Economic Community of Central African States, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.61. The list of additional sponsors is available through the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.61 was adopted.

The Chair: I now call on delegations wishing to explain their positions after action on the draft resolutions and decisions.

Mr. Nasir (Malaysia): Malaysia is taking the floor to explain its votes on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.39 and draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1.

As has been our tradition in the past, Malaysia joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.39, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”. Malaysia appreciates the efforts undertaken by the main sponsor in consulting and engaging with Member States in an attempt to preserve the consensual basis of the draft resolution. Malaysia reaffirms the role of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament-related treaties. We will continue to support the efforts undertaken by the CD, which contribute to general and complete disarmament. We welcome efforts by any party to support the substantive work of the CD. While we are guided by the discussions and deliberation that took place in Geneva, we hope that the draft resolution will continue to enjoy consensus in future.

Malaysia also supported and voted in favour of draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1, entitled “2020 session of the Disarmament Commission”. Malaysia would like to thank the main sponsors, namely, Australia and Hungary, for the work undertaken, including rounds of consultations, prior to presenting the draft decision. In our view, the document just adopted signifies the importance of enhancing the function and improving the effectiveness of the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Malaysia, reaffirming the relevance and importance of the Disarmament Commission as the sole specialized deliberative body within the multilateral disarmament machinery, expresses its regret about the inability of the Disarmament Commission to hold a substantive session this year. We hope that it will convene the substantive session in 2020, as envisaged in the draft resolution.

With regard to the proposed amendment to the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph (a) of the text, Malaysia welcomes the work undertaken by the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. We have listened very closely to the discussions in the room today. However, we are cautious about the approach of connecting and tying the work and functions of the Disarmament Commission to the issues being discussed by the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. Malaysia believes that the matter would be more properly addressed in the Sixth Committee. Accordingly, Malaysia voted against the

proposed amendments. Let me emphasize that our vote should be understood as Malaysia’s principled position of preserving the disarmament machinery and not of downplaying the importance of issues being discussed in the Committee on Relations with the Host Country and the Sixth Committee.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to explain Mexico’s position on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.39, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament” and draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1, entitled “2020 session of the Disarmament Commission”.

First, we deplore the fact that several delegations that are friends of Mexico experience difficulties in participating in the meetings of the United Nations, and we wish to express solidarity with them. Nonetheless, deliberations to find possible solutions to that issue are taking place in other Committees. We do not believe that the First Committee is the appropriate forum for taking a decision on the issue. We do not believe that the Committee is the right forum for lodging a complaint against the host country or that it is appropriate for discussion on the issue to be used as a condition for the start of our work.

The General Assembly should compile the respective reports of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) and the Conference on Disarmament (CD). Draft resolutions of the First Committee should not be the setting for resolving issues that have not yet been settled in the Commission or in the Conference in Geneva. However, although draft resolutions offer up views or a narrative on the forums that present reports, they should be based on facts. That is why we are concerned about the fact that the draft resolution on the UNDC contains language that is not a true reflection of what occurred in April, which resulted in the lack of substantive work. Similarly, it makes inconsistent assertions, as it refers to rules that should have guided substantive decision-making in the UNDC — a subsidiary body of the General Assembly — when the consensus rule was used to block the work of the session.

In a world that is increasingly polarized and given the extremely complex security and stability situation today, it is more important than ever before to restore the multilateral discussion forums used to meet each other and build an essential regulatory framework for promoting international peace and security. In the first

special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD-I), the international community determined the UNDC to be the deliberative forum and the CD to be the forum for multilateral negotiations of legally binding global disarmament instruments. It is therefore important to describe the situation with precision.

Over the past 23 years, the CD has been actively engaged in exercises in non-existent diplomacy because its members have been addressing a programme of work without adopting or implementing it. As a result, there have been no negotiations or binding disarmament agreements in the CD since 1996. Every year that the CD merely deliberates, in addition to failing to fulfil its negotiating mandate, it disrupts the disarmament machinery by duplicating, even usurping, the functions of the UNDC. Mexico also notes with regret that the CD is being used by members wishing to take a stance on issues outside of its purview and mandate, in order to promote regional and bilateral issues that serve only to polarize its members and lead to excessive politicization, instead of the essential dialogue needed to fulfil the Conference's mandate. It causes the forum to lose its relevance.

That situation was particularly demanding at the current session of the CD and in negotiations on the draft resolution covering the Conference's report. This crisis has taken the form of the adoption for two consecutive years of procedural reports that do not show any substantive progress. We acknowledge that some delegations are ready to maintain the status quo, worsen the paralysis and avail themselves of rules and procedures that are in their favour so as to impose their position or that of the minority on the views of the majority, without any regard for the international community.

The foregoing seems to be the trend in the UNDC and the First Committee. It is clear that there is an institutional crisis in the entire disarmament machinery established in the Final Document of SSOD-I (S-10/2). Each time that my delegation has been critical, we were told that we should convene the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and modify the disarmament forums in such a session, which is why Mexico today urges that the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament be convened as soon as possible.

Notwithstanding the precedent in the First Committee, the least that the General Assembly could do is express its concern about the lack of substantive progress in disarmament forums. We do not believe that we must continue using language that would give the impression that all is well in the texts of General Assembly draft resolutions to the benefit of the international community in general. We must genuinely assess the real situation and establish minimum benchmarks for recovering the multilateral institutional framework required for us to address the fundamental threat that nuclear weapons, in particular, pose to the very existence of humankind.

Ms. Lal (India): I have taken the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft amendment A/C.1/74/L.62 to draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1, entitled "2020 session of the Disarmament Commission", and to that draft decision.

India accords high importance to the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC), as part of the triad of the disarmament machinery and as a universal deliberative forum for disarmament issues. Therefore, the effective, efficient, objective and inclusive functioning of the UNDC is of paramount importance to my delegation. It is regrettable that issues pertaining to the denial of visas to the representatives of some Member States have not yet been resolved. We hope that a solution will be found soon.

At the same time, it is incumbent on all Member States to ensure the continued effective functioning of the United Nations disarmament machinery, especially at a time when it is already under strain. My delegation therefore abstained in the voting on draft amendment A/C.1/74/L.62 and voted in favour of operative paragraphs (a) and (b) of draft decision A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1.

The Chair: The Committee will now turn to the remaining draft proposals contained in informal paper No. 4, beginning with those listed under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons".

I now open the floor to delegations wishing to make either a general statement or to introduce new or revised drafts under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons". Delegations are reminded that general statements are limited to five minutes.

Mr. Situmorang (Indonesia): The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (NAM) has submitted a

technical update of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1, entitled “Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”.

The country-specific reference has been removed from the fourteenth preambular paragraph of the text. NAM expresses that this change does not modify its position on the United States 2018 Nuclear Posture Review, which was agreed in the Final Document of the eighteenth Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Movement, held in Baku, and set forth in the following paragraphs of the Final Document.

In paragraph 244 of the Final Document, the Heads of State and Government reiterated with concern that improvements in existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons, as provided for in the military doctrines of some nuclear-weapon States, including the United States Nuclear Posture Review, violate their legal obligations on nuclear disarmament, as well as the commitments made to diminish the role of nuclear weapons in their military and security policies and contravene the negative security assurances provided by the nuclear-weapon States. They stress once again that these improvements, as well as the development of new types of such weapons, also violate the commitments undertaken by nuclear-weapon States at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and at the Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

In paragraph 258 of the Final Document, the Heads of State and Government stressed the significance of achieving universal adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, especially by all nuclear-weapon States, which, *inter alia*, should contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament. In this regard, they expressed concern about the decision of the United States not to seek the ratification of the CTBT, as announced in its 2018 Nuclear Posture Review, taking into account the special responsibility of the nuclear-weapon States for the realization of the entry into force of the CTBT. They reiterated that if the objectives of the Treaty were to be fully realized, the continued commitment of all State signatories, especially the nuclear-weapon States, to nuclear disarmament would be essential. In this context, the ratification of the CTBT by Myanmar, Swaziland, Thailand and Zimbabwe, as well as its signature by Tuvalu, were welcomed.

In paragraph 259 of the Final Document, the Heads of State and Government recall the commitments made towards the full implementation of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START) between the Russian Federation and the United States, as well as the need for follow-up measures in order to achieve deeper reductions in their nuclear arsenals. They stressed that the reductions in deployment and operational status, although they may contribute to risk reduction, cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in and the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In this context, they call on the United States and the Russian Federation to apply the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability to such cuts to further reduce their nuclear arsenals, both warheads and delivery systems, thus contributing to the fulfilment of their nuclear disarmament obligations and facilitating the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons, at the earliest date.

In paragraph 260 of the Final Document, the Heads of State and Government took note of the successful completion of the commitments by the Russian Federation and the United States under the New START. The Heads of State and Government expressed concern because the strategic dialogue among the nuclear-weapon States has remained limited and there are no negotiations under way for further strategic nuclear-arms reduction beyond the expiration of the New START in 2021. They called for the renewal of the commitments agreed within the framework of the Treaty. Nonetheless, they expressed their grave concern about the United States Nuclear Posture Review and its national security strategy, which goes against the legal obligations and undertakings to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals and threatens international peace and security.

NAM calls on States to maintain wide support for draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1, as a whole, and for any paragraph to be voted on separately.

Mr. Nasir (Malaysia): Malaysia is pleased to present to the First Committee its traditional draft resolution, as document A/C.1/74/L.40, under agenda item 98 (I), entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons”.

Malaysia first introduced this annual draft resolution in 1996. It builds upon the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons of 8 July 1996.

The advisory opinion was an important milestone in the global campaign for nuclear disarmament. Together with like-minded States, Malaysia considers the unanimous opinion of the International Court of Justice on the existence of that obligation to constitute a clear basis for early or immediate follow-up actions by States in their determined efforts to rid the world of nuclear weapons, including negotiations leading to the conclusion of a nuclear-weapons convention.

Compared to a similar draft resolution that was adopted by the seventy-third session of the First Committee in 2018 (A/73/510 DR XXXII), the draft resolution that is now presented to the Committee only contains technical updates. The draft does not contain any substantive change from the previously adopted resolution.

We hope that draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.40 will continue to garner wide support from Member States as we strive to achieve the ultimate goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Malaysia would like to express sincere appreciation to our traditional partners that have co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.40 and count on the wide support of others for it.

Ms. Sánchez Rodríguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba co-sponsored and will vote in favour of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1, entitled “Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”, and A/C.1/74/L.40, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons”.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1, entitled “Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”, we would like to highlight that this initiative of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries allows us on 26 September each year to celebrate the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. This year, we managed to strengthen the language of the draft resolution by expressing concern about improvements in existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons, as provided for in the military doctrines of some nuclear-weapon States, including the United States 2018 Nuclear Posture Review, which violate their legal obligations on nuclear disarmament, as well as the commitments made to diminish the role of nuclear weapons in their military and security policies and contravene the

negative security assurances provided by the nuclear-weapon States. We urge States to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1 and any specific paragraphs put to the vote separately.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.40, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons”, the text reaffirms that the continued existence of nuclear weapons is a threat to humankind. It also reaffirms the determination of the international community to achieve a world without nuclear weapons, via the total elimination of such weapons. Similarly, the text underscores the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice in 1996 that there is an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.

We urge the nuclear-weapon States to demonstrate political will and reaffirm their postures, in particular in the light of the fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and revise them during the current review cycle. We call for the implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the fulfilment of commitments made in previous Review Conferences, in particular with regard to the nuclear-disarmament pillar. We also urge members to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.40, as a whole, and any specific paragraphs to be voted on separately.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.26/Rev.1, entitled “Nuclear disarmament verification”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.26 was submitted by the representative of Norway on 15 October. Subsequently, revised draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.26/Rev.1 was submitted on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.26/Rev.1. The list of additional sponsors is available through the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The present oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of operative paragraphs 2, 6, 7, 8 and 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.26/Rev.1, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to seek the substantive views of Member States on the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Nuclear Disarmament Verification and to report back to the General Assembly at its seventy-fifth session; request the Secretary-General to establish a group of governmental experts of up to 25 participants chosen on the basis of equitable geographical representation and an equitable representation of women and men, which will meet in Geneva for four sessions of one week each in 2021 and 2022, to further consider nuclear-disarmament verification issues, including, *inter alia*, the concept of a Group of Scientific and Technical Experts, building on the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Nuclear Disarmament Verification and the views of Member States referred to in paragraph 2; request the Chair of the group of governmental experts to organize in New York two open-ended informal intersessional consultative meetings to allow all Member States to engage in interactive discussions and share their views, which the Chair shall convey to the group of governmental experts for its consideration; request the Secretary-General to render all necessary assistance to the group of governmental experts and its Chair, including the provision of relevant documents; and call upon the Secretary-General to transmit the report of the group of governmental experts to the General Assembly at its seventy-seventh session and to the Conference on Disarmament.

Pursuant to the request contained in operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, it is currently envisaged that the four sessions in Geneva of the group of governmental experts of one week each in 2021 and 2022 would comprise two sessions of one week each in 2021 and two sessions of one week each in 2022, with interpretation in all six official languages. This would constitute an addition to the meeting workload for the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management in 2021 and 2022 and entail additional non-recurrent resource requirements in the amount of \$344,000, comprising \$172,000 in 2021 and \$172,000 in 2022. In addition, sound technician/recording services would be required in support of the meetings, which would entail additional non-recurrent resource requirements in the amount of \$14,200, comprising \$7,100 in 2021 and \$7,100 in 2022.

With regard to operative paragraph 7, the two informal intersessional consultative meetings in New York, comprising one one-day meeting in 2021 and one one-day meeting in 2022, with interpretation in all six official languages, would constitute an addition to the meeting workload in 2021 and 2022, respectively, and entail additional non-recurrent requirements in the amount of \$23,800, comprising \$11,900 in 2021 and \$11,900 in 2022.

In addition, the requests for documentation contained in operative paragraphs 2 and 9 would constitute an addition to the documentation workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management in New York of one pre-session document of 10,700 words in all six official languages in 2020 and one post-session document of 10,700 words in all six official languages in 2022. Additional non-recurrent requirements for documentation in the amount of \$34,100 would arise in 2022, while additional requirements for 2020 in the amount of \$34,100 would be met within the programme budget proposed for approval for 2020.

The requirements for documentation arising from operative paragraph 6 would constitute an addition to the documentation workload in Geneva of one pre-session document of 2,500 words in all six official languages and one in-session document in English only in both 2021 and 2022. Additional non-recurrent requirements for documentation would arise in the amount of \$17,200, comprising \$8,600 in 2021 and \$8,600 in 2022.

Furthermore, it is estimated that a total non-recurrent amount of \$522,000, comprising an amount of \$261,000 for each of 2021 and 2022, would be required under section 4, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budgets for 2021 and 2022, respectively. The annual provision of \$261,000 for each of 2021 and 2022 consists of an amount of \$236,000 to cover the travel costs, daily subsistence allowance and terminal expenses for 25 experts, and an amount of \$25,000 to cover the costs of the services of a consultant to provide technical and substantive support to the group of governmental experts.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.26/Rev.1, additional resource requirements, estimated in the amounts of \$460,600 and \$494,700, would be included in the proposed programme budgets for 2021 and 2022,

respectively, under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management”, section 4, “Disarmament”, and section 29E, “Administration, Geneva”, as set out in the table in paragraph 7 of the proposed programme budgets.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, 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, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, 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, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United

States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Russian Federation

Abstaining:

China, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Syrian Arab Republic, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted by 173 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1, entitled “Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31 was submitted 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, on 16 October. Subsequently, revised draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1 was submitted on 4 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1.

The present oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1, the General Assembly would decide to convene, in New York, on a date to be decided later, a United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament to review the progress made in this regard.

Pursuant to the requests contained in operative paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 12 of General Assembly resolution 72/251, entitled “Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”, provisions were made for the holding of a United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament during the biennium 2018-2019, including a one-day organizational meeting in 2018. Subsequently, by its decision 72/556, the General Assembly decided to postpone the conference and its organizational meeting until a date to be decided by the Assembly, with the understanding that resources

for the conference would continue to be available for the duration of the biennium. In the event that the General Assembly decided to hold the conference after 31 December 2019, it was understood that the decision would give rise to programme budget implications.

With regard to operative paragraph 5 of this draft resolution, it is understood that issues related to the high-level international conference, including the date, format and scope of the conference, have yet to be determined. Accordingly, in the absence of modalities for the conference, it is not possible at the present time to estimate the potential cost implications of meetings and documentation requirements. Upon the decision on the modalities of the conference, the Secretary-General would submit the relevant costs of such requirements, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Accordingly, at this time, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1 would not give rise to any programme budget implications.

The Chair: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the fourteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1. I shall therefore put that paragraph to the vote first.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, 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, Eswatini, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles,

Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Ireland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Malta, New Zealand, North Macedonia, San Marino, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay, Zimbabwe

The fourteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 115 votes to 35, with 18 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1, as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic

Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Re-public of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Finland, Georgia, Japan, North Macedonia, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 137 votes to 33, with 10 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.40, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.40 was submitted by the representative of Malaysia on 16 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.40. The list of additional sponsors is

available through the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the ninth and seventeenth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.40. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote one by one.

I shall now put to the vote the ninth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Armenia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, France, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Latvia, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The ninth preambular paragraph was retained by 135 votes to 1, with 30 abstentions.

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

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote the seventeenth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Finland, India, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland

The seventeenth preambular paragraph was retained by 116 votes to 36, with 14 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United

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

Against:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Finland, India, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Pakistan, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 114 votes to 36, with 15 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.40, as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of

Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Georgia, Iceland, India, Japan, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), North Macedonia, Serbia, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.40, as a whole, was adopted by 132 votes to 32, with 17 abstentions.

The Chair: I now call on delegations wishing to explain their vote after the voting.

Mr. Hassan (Egypt): I take the floor to explain my delegation's vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/74/L.26/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament verification", on which we voted in favour.

My delegation appreciates the constructive and cooperative manner in which Norway, the lead sponsor of the draft resolution, together with other sponsors, conducted consultations on the proposal. Egypt voted in favour of the draft resolution as a sign of our continued commitment to irreversible and verifiable nuclear disarmament. We underscore that the draft proposal welcomed the consensus reached by the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Nuclear Disarmament Verification in a manner that does not

express an endorsement by the General Assembly of the report contained in document A/74/90. In this regard, we are inclined to place on record that we have multiple reservations about the report of the GGE and its possible unintended negative implications on the objective of achieving nuclear disarmament and on the relevant agreed obligations. We intend to submit our detailed reservations about the GGE report to the Secretary-General in due course.

Mr. Masmajeán (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): We take the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1. We abstained in the voting on this draft resolution although we supported it in previous sessions of the First Committee. We firmly believe in the need to develop new legally binding instruments or norms, based on the cornerstone of the disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation regime, namely, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in order to establish and preserve a world free of nuclear weapons. Accordingly, we believe that the negotiation of a comprehensive nuclear-weapons convention is not the only possible option and is perhaps not the most promising today. Furthermore, we have several questions concerning the new fourteenth preambular paragraph, which was introduced in this year's draft resolution.

Ms. Claringbould (Netherlands): I would like to make this explanation of vote on behalf of the following countries: Belgium, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey and my own country, the Netherlands.

We would like to explain our vote against draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1, entitled "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament". All of us share the long-term goal of the draft resolution, namely, achieving and maintaining a world free of nuclear weapons. We all supported the holding of the high-level meeting on nuclear disarmament in 2013 and we all participated constructively in that meeting, discussing how to best achieve a world without nuclear weapons. At the 2013 meeting, we made various proposals on how to reach this shared goal. We therefore regret that these proposals were not captured in subsequent years' resolutions on the 2013 high-level meeting. Unfortunately, the draft submitted this year does not address our concerns either, which leaves us with no choice but to voice

our continuing concern about this draft resolution once more.

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is the foundation of the international disarmament and non-proliferation regime. It is the international legal instrument that sets the framework for achieving and maintaining a nuclear-weapon-free world. However, draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1 fails to acknowledge the central role of the NPT and its review cycle.

The States parties to the NPT have confirmed, by consensus, that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. That is why we welcome the call in the draft resolution to negotiate effective disarmament measures. However, since the proposals we made at the 2013 high-level meeting and the concerns we raised subsequently have not been acknowledged in the draft resolution, we do not believe that the United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament, to be convened at a date to be decided later, sets the right mandate for such negotiations.

Ms. Lal (India): I have asked for the floor to explain India's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L. 40, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons".

India has been the only State possessing nuclear weapons to traditionally co-sponsor the draft resolution. We are disappointed that substantive changes were made to the traditional text of the draft resolution in 2017. In particular, we are disappointed that references to the early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention, based on the model nuclear weapons convention, co-submitted by the lead sponsors themselves, have been dropped. Furthermore, the objective of the draft resolution, as reflected in operative paragraph 2, is ambiguous. Therefore, my delegation withdrew its sponsorship and abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Ms. Sánchez Rodríguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): We have requested the floor to explain Cuba's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.26/Rev.1.

Cuba voted in favour of the draft resolution, entitled "Nuclear disarmament verification", because we are committed to the shared goal of achieving and maintaining a world free of nuclear weapons. However, this year's draft resolution contains significant changes

that undermine the balance of the draft resolution. It eliminates various provisions of resolution 71/67, including its fourth preambular paragraph, which reiterated deep concern at the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons; operative paragraph 6, recalling the commitment of nuclear-weapon States to nuclear disarmament; the previous seventh preambular paragraph, which specifically referred to the principles of verifiability, and the previous operative paragraph 1, which called for a further reduction in the number or total elimination of nuclear weapons.

It is unclear why those paragraphs have been eliminated, in particular since no progress has been made in the areas of nuclear disarmament and international security and previous commitments have not been honoured. Cuba believes that the General Assembly needs time to consider the report of the recently concluded Group of Governmental Experts, which met in 2018 and 2019, to properly review its recommendations. We believe that it is premature for us to welcome that report and establish another group of governmental experts — a proposal that does not even appear in the conclusions and recommendations of the report of the Group, which recently concluded without reaching a consensus.

Instead of creating a new group of experts, we proposed that the draft resolution seek to provide a framework for broad inclusive, democratic, transparent and participatory discussion that would enable the representatives of member States to share their views on the most recent report of the Group of Governmental Experts and better understand the issue.

We regret the fact that the amendments proposed, including by our delegation, were not taken into account. That led even traditional authors of the text to withdraw their sponsorship. It is of concern that both the recent report of the Group of Experts and the draft resolution attempt to reframe the scant progress made in the area of nuclear disarmament, given the supposed lack of a credible multilateral verification regime. Similarly, the draft resolution acknowledges initiatives agreed outside the framework of the United Nations, with no reference made to the central role of the International Atomic Energy Agency. We believe that multilateral verification should not be an end in itself but rather another step forward on the path to nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.26/Rev.1. The text on nuclear disarmament verification seeks to advance the idea of developing procedures and technologies for nuclear disarmament verification for their potential use in certain future agreements. We cannot agree with that approach. Verification activities, separate from any specific agreement in the area of arms control and reduction, have no practical value. Russia's experience has shown that the development of verification mechanisms requires the meticulous consideration of an entire set of operative and technical aspects related to the design of nuclear weapons and the specificities of their deployment and use. Such information is sensitive and cannot and should not be revealed to outside verifiers.

Accordingly, it cannot be taken into account remotely, and especially in advance, as it is impossible to foresee the subject and scope of future arms control agreements. Recommendations formulated in such a manner would be limited, vague and far removed from actual practice. We must also not forget that participation in the verification of the implementation of agreements is open only to parties to that agreement or bodies specifically appointed by them. In addition, focusing attention on verification issues distracts the attention of the international community from the paramount issues of international security, which have a direct impact on the prospects of nuclear disarmament.

We have repeatedly raised those issues, including at the current session, and encouraged their detailed consideration. Only by marking the way forward and reaching agreement on the establishment of political and normative frameworks in the area of arms control will we be able to discuss the implementation procedures for related agreements, including in the area of verification. Such measures must be based on consensus and take into account the interests of all parties.

In addition, we believe it premature to change the mandate of the Group of Governmental Experts from consideration of the role of verification in advancing nuclear disarmament, as provided for by the new draft resolution. That was another reason that prevented us from supporting it. Overall, given the budget crisis of the United Nations, we are opposed to spending money on the activities of entities whose effectiveness raises serious doubts and whose work could lead to

violations of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Ms. Delaroche (France) (*spoke in French*): My delegation wishes to recall the validity of the explanation of vote we made on 1 November (see A/C.1/74/PV.22) on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom and my own country, France, on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.31/Rev.1, entitled “Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”. That explanation of vote is available on the PaperSmart portal.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting on cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”.

The Committee will now turn to the remaining draft proposals listed under cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”.

The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.53/Rev.1, entitled “Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.53 was submitted by the representatives of Germany and France on 17 October. Subsequently, a revised draft resolution, A/C.1/74/L.53/Rev.1, was submitted on 6 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.53/Rev.1. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Chile has also become a sponsor.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.53/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: I now call on delegations wishing to explain their position after the voting.

Mr. Ahmed (Pakistan): Pakistan has joined the consensus on the draft resolution entitled “Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus”, contained in document A/C.1/74/L.53/Rev.1. We would like

to highlight a few points with respect to that draft resolution.

First, the largest stockpiles of conventional armaments and ammunition are maintained by the major military Powers. They should therefore take the lead in assessing surplus stockpiles and their safe disposal.

Secondly, such efforts could be supplemented by actions at the regional and subregional levels to prevent excessive accumulation, as well as imbalances in conventional armaments and military forces.

Thirdly, while it may not be possible to have a universal definition of surplus stockpiles of armaments or their ammunition, some general guidelines could be developed on the basis of previous work done under the auspices of the United Nations.

Pakistan has been working assiduously towards the associated goal of promoting conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels. We believe that international efforts towards disarmament and arms control are reinforced and complemented by regional approaches to that end.

The Chair: I shall now call on those representatives who have requested the floor to speak in exercise of the right of reply. In that connection, I remind all delegations that the first intervention in exercise of the right of reply should be limited to five minutes and the second to three minutes.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I am compelled to respond to the statement made by my colleague of the United States, which is a textbook example of cynicism and the manipulation of public opinion.

Lawful demands with regard to the compliance of the authorities of the United States with their obligations under the 1947 Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations have been deemed to be hostile. Our attempts to improve the visa situation have been described as aggressive. In the words of the head of the delegation of the United States, our appeal to the delegations in the First Committee for support seeks to undermine the work of the First Committee and the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

What transcends all bounds of diplomatic ethics is the assertion that the adoption of Russian amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.52/Rev.1 would be the

beginning of the end of our universal Organization. We categorically oppose such faulty logic because, if one were to follow it, then the clear disregard of the United States for international law and the views of the majority of the States Members of the United Nations — which, in 1999, led to the bombing of Yugoslavia; in 2003, to the invasion of Iraq; and, recently, to the unprecedented presence of United States armed forces in Syria — would be nothing more than an attempt to strengthen our Organization and facilitate its growth. It is obvious to everyone that this is not the case.

I would ask our colleagues of the United States to reject such faulty logic, in particular given that it does not work in their favour. It is not the Russian Federation but the United States that violates its obligations under the 1947 Agreement. Therefore, it is the United States

that undermines the authority of the United Nations and the activities of its main bodies and committees. That is also a fact. I would therefore ask that the delegation of the United States not attempt to mislead the Committee. Facts are facts, and there is nothing that can be done about that.

The Chair: Given the time remaining for the meeting and given the provisions of rule 128 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which stipulates that no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting, the Committee will proceed with the voting on the remaining draft proposals contained in informal paper No. 4 at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.