



General Assembly

Seventy-sixth session

First Committee

17th meeting

Wednesday, 3 November 2021, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Hilale (Morocco)

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Agenda items 92 to 107 (continued)

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

The Chair (*spoke in French*): The Committee will continue to take action on the draft resolutions and draft decisions submitted under cluster 5, “Other disarmament measures and international security”. Thereafter, we will consider the draft provisional programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2022, as contained in document A/C.1/76/CRP.5.

However, before proceeding to those items, I wish to note that a delegation that was not able to take the floor yesterday in explanation of vote or position before action is taken under cluster 5 has requested the floor. I now give the floor to the representative of China.

Mr. Geng Shuang (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.16, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”. I will now elaborate China’s position.

In a video statement delivered at the Conference on Disarmament in June, His Excellency Mr. Wang Yi, State Councilor and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, called on all nations to uphold multilateralism; pursue a common comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable approach to global security; collectively maintain global strategic stability; and strictly observe international arms control

treaties. His statement fully demonstrated China’s consistent position on international arms control and non-proliferation.

I would like to reiterate that China has strictly complied with all its obligations and commitments arising from the international arms control and non-proliferation treaties to which it has acceded. Within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations, we support Member States in strictly implementing their treaty obligations and responsibilities. And by strengthening such efforts and implementing arms control and non-proliferation treaty obligations, we continue to contribute to maintaining international and regional peace, security and stability. For those reasons, China supports the basic purposes and principles of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.16.

At the same time, as I said in my statement during the general debate (see A/C.1/76/PV.3), it is the responsibility of States to comply with treaty obligations and observe multilateral rules, and the major Powers should play a leading role in that regard.

The rules-based system of international arms control treaties created by the international community over a period of decades is an important cornerstone for the maintenance of international peace and stability and the common heritage of the international community. It should be strengthened, not weakened, and should be actively supported and safeguarded by all countries.

Many recent events have repeatedly shown that the United States, the main sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.16, has a dismal track record

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>).



of compliance with agreements and commitments on non-proliferation, arms limitations and disarmament. The entire international community bears witness to that, and China pays great attention to it as well.

The United States has the most advanced and the largest number of nuclear weapons. Based on relevant General Assembly outcome documents, the United States, as the only country with a chemical weapons stockpile, should fully assume its special and primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament and further significantly reduce its arsenal.

As a State party to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, the United States should immediately and comprehensively destroy its huge chemical weapons stockpile. It should promote the discussion of an additional protocol instead of carrying out chemical weapons-related military activities on a large scale, as a beneficiary of the international non-proliferation mechanism.

The United States should halt its nuclear submarine cooperation with the United Kingdom and Australia, abandon double standards and reject actions that are in serious violation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, as an advocate of the multilateral disarmament mechanism.

The United States should support the role of the United Nations as the core of the multilateral arms control and disarmament system, instead of using a Cold War mentality to politicize the multilateral arms control issue through its negative performance in multilateral arms control and disarmament, as well as its action yesterday in calling on Member States to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 (see A/C.1/76/PV.16).

China has no choice but to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.16. China would like to see the United States play a leading role in promoting strict compliance with international arms control and non-proliferation treaties instead of merely paying lip service to it.

China hopes that the United States will discontinue its provocation and confrontation and its corruption of the working environment of the First Committee so that we can work with all Member States to promote international arms control and advance the disarmament process in a constructive manner.

The Chair (*spoke in French*): I see that the night was a source of inspiration for other delegations.

I now call on the representative of the Russian Federation on a point of order.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I wish to speak on a point of order concerning today's meeting. I apologize for interrupting the process with a statement in explanation of vote before the voting, but I believe that the question that I have just touched upon is exceedingly important for all of our delegations.

A perplexing situation occurred yesterday. Our meeting (see A/C.1/76/PV.16) concluded 20 minutes early, and we did not have an opportunity to vote on the draft resolutions submitted under cluster 5. As we see it, that situation was strange, to say the least, especially given that the Chair initially announced that the voting would be held and that the interpreters were willing to continue. We were ready to conclude consideration of the draft resolutions submitted under cluster 5 without even extending the meeting.

In comparison, action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.59 was initiated after the time scheduled for the meeting had already expired, and it continued for a further 25 minutes, while yesterday we would have needed at most a further 15 minutes.

It is easy to count. We took 19 actions on the Japanese draft resolution, while yesterday, judging by document A/C.1/76/INF.2/Rev.5, only half as many actions were planned on the draft resolutions submitted under cluster 5.

Furthermore, we believe it is not acceptable to separate the explanations of vote from the voting itself.

Another point is that, officially, the current session of the First Committee concludes on 4 November. In a previous meeting, the Chair mentioned that, if we were unable to conclude the voting on 3 November, which is today, the process would be continued on Friday, 5 November, which was set aside because there were allegedly no locations available at Headquarters on 4 November, which is an extra day reserved for voting, for the holding of the meeting. But to vote on 5 November, the Fifth Committee and the delegations participating therein, shall take a decision to that effect, given that, once again, officially the work of the First Committee was scheduled to conclude on 4 November.

I also wish to note that many delegations had planned to leave New York in line with the schedule previously adopted by delegations on 30 September. Specifically, they had planned to return either to their capitals or to their areas of permanent employment on 3 and 4 November. For that reason, those delegations will not be in a position to take part in the proceedings of the First Committee on 5 November. That is a fact that also needs to be borne in mind in the planning of our further work.

In that connection, I wish to request that you, the Chair and the Secretariat of the First Committee, seek the opportunity to conclude the voting procedure today. To that end, there is a possibility to extend today's morning meeting and to make use of lunchtime, or organize a second meeting after lunch later in the day.

I ask that the Chair seriously consider our proposal, because that will determine both the course and the results of the voting on the remaining draft resolutions.

The Chair (*spoke in French*): I thank the representative of the Russian Federation for his explanation and point of order. I think there is a need for some clarification and response to that.

First, yesterday's meeting (see A/C.1/76/PV.16) was adjourned because the Secretariat and the chairmanship received a notification from the interpreters to conclude at 6 p.m. It was not possible to work beyond 6 p.m. owing to the need to respect multilingualism. All delegations must be able to work on an equal footing and under the best possible conditions.

Secondly, I think that, until now, we have conducted meetings with due respect for procedures, time and virtually the entire agenda agreed by the First Committee at the opening of the current session. We intend to continue to adhere to that respect and to continue to do so in a manner that is both inclusive and that takes into account the concerns of all parties. Of course, we plan to conclude our meeting in the allotted time. If we are not able to do so, it is not because the Secretariat or the chairmanship did not attempt to extend the meeting. I am the first to not want to extend beyond 5 November, because I know that there are other delegations that must return to their capitals. But as Committee members know, we cannot control what is impossible.

However, we have planned for that eventuality and if necessary, as I explained at the beginning of the meeting, it will be possible to request further meetings,

and the Secretariat will take the necessary measures to also ensure the provision of interpretation. During our general debate and the thematic debate, we concluded before the scheduled time; to be able to conclude after the scheduled time would be an inevitability that we would have to assume responsibility for.

For that reason, I would like to reassure the Russian representative that his considerations were taken into account and that everything will be done for us to be able to conclude on time. However, if we are unable to conclude on time, we shall coordinate with the Secretariat on ways to address the concerns voiced by some delegations, some of whose members must leave New York after having participated in almost all of the voting.

I mentioned earlier that the night was a source of inspiration for other delegations, and I hope that it will also be a source of inspiration for cooperation, understanding and flexibility. We have worked in a good and convivial atmosphere, and I hope that we will be able to continue without interpretation should unforeseeable circumstances arise. I commend the work of the Secretariat and the work of the interpreters. The other day we concluded at 1.30 p.m. The interpreters remained with us for 30 minutes after the conclusion of the time set aside for the meeting, and we are very grateful for their efforts.

We will do everything possible to conclude on time. However, in order to do so, I need the cooperation of all delegations. If explanations of vote before or after the voting and statements in general all last 10 minutes, we cannot limit the time for such statements. Many delegations take the floor for that purpose. We have sought to provide an opportunity for all of them to be able to take the floor, and will continue to do so. I therefore request delegations' understanding.

Mr. Sarwani (Pakistan): I take this opportunity to explain my delegation's vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.6, entitled "Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament".

My delegation will join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.6. However, I would like to explain my delegation's position on the rights regarding the development, production, transfer and use of technologies for peaceful purposes, as contained in the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

Science and technology have been recognized as critical enablers for the Sustainable Development Goals. As such, it is every country's inalienable and inherent right to develop, utilize and acquire technologies for socioeconomic development and overcome the challenges of climate change, disease, water scarcity, energy and food security.

Pakistan believes that proliferation concerns should not become a pretext for the nine advanced or dual-use technologies, especially in instances where recipient States stand ready to provide non-diverging assurances. Such denials are often politically motivated. It is important that the right to access technologies and socioeconomic development be ensured on a non-discriminatory basis for all States, especially developing countries.

The Chair (*spoke in French*): I call on the representative of Belarus on a point of order.

Mr. Tozik (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): We asked for the floor on a point of order and to support the concerns voiced by the Russian delegation. We thank the Chair for the exhaustive explanation about the situation that has unfolded with the allocation of time for First Committee meetings. At the same time, we would also like to stress the fact that we fail to understand why yesterday's meeting (see A/C.1/76/PV.16) was adjourned 20 minutes before the end of the meeting. As we see it, there was sufficient time for the conduct of a voting on a draft resolution under cluster 5.

The Chair (*spoke in French*): Is this an explanation of vote or a point of order? If it is merely a point of order, I believe that I addressed the concern voiced by our Russian colleague. I will be very grateful if the representative of Belarus would limit his statement to an explanation of vote. What happened yesterday is concluded. We have provided explanations and assurances. I ask for the understanding of the representative of Belarus.

Mr. Tozik (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): We will not take up any more time. I would just like to thank the Chair for his thorough explanation and to emphasize our concern about the situation that transpired yesterday. There was enough time to proceed further yesterday, given that one week ago we ended the meeting half an hour later than the scheduled time for the meeting.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.6, entitled

“Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.6 was submitted by the representative of India on 5 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.6. 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 draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.6 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security, and advancing responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13 was submitted by the representatives of the Russian Federation and the United States of America on 6 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.13. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Sierra Leone and Togo have also become sponsors.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.13 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.16, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.16 was submitted by the representative of the United States of America on 7 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed

in document A/C.1/76/L.16. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. El Salvador has also become a sponsor.

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, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, 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, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining:

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.16 was adopted by 166 votes to 3, with 10 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.24, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.24 was submitted by the representative of the Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries on 8 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.24.

The Chair: The sponsor of the draft resolution has 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.1/76/L.24 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.26, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.26 was submitted by the representative of the Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries on 8 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.26.

The Chair: The sponsor of the draft resolution has 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.1/76/L.26 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.27, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.27 was submitted by the representative of the Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries on 8 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.27.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.27 was adopted by 125 votes to 4, with 51 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.36, entitled “Youth, disarmament and non-proliferation”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.36 was submitted by the representative of the Republic of Korea on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.36.

The present 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.1/76/L.36, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States, the United Nations, other relevant international and regional organizations and civil society organizations on the issue of the promotion of youth engagement and empowerment activities in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation and to submit a report thereon to the General Assembly at its seventy-eighth session.

With regard to paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.36, the request for documentation will constitute an addition to the documentation workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management of one pre-session document with a word count of 10,700 words in all six languages in 2023.

Additional resource requirements for documentation would arise in 2023 in the amount of \$33,900. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.36, the additional resource requirements in the amount of \$33,900 would be included in the proposed programme budget for 2023 under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management".

The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Sri Lanka has also become a sponsor.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on the tenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.36.

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, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia,

South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Djibouti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

The tenth preambular paragraph was retained by 168 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

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.1/76/L.36, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful users in the context of international security".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of China. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.55.

A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution has been issued as document A/C.1/76/L.64 and is available on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. The Gambia has also become a sponsor.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55. I shall now put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 2.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, 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

Abstaining:

Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Georgia, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Uruguay, Zambia

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 68 votes to 53, with 37 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 3.

In favour:

Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Georgia, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia

Paragraph 3 was retained by 69 votes to 54, with 35 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Gabon, Georgia, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India,

Jamaica, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, as a whole, was adopted by 75 votes to 55, with 43 abstentions.

The Chair (*spoke in French*): I shall now give the floor to those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted. I would be grateful if speakers would be brief so that we make complete our work in a timely manner.

Mr. Ruidíaz Pérez (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): I take the floor to explain my delegation's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security".

We recognize China's efforts to draft a text that covers the identification of elements related to the non-proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, as well as international cooperation, peaceful uses, and threats to international peace and security. However, in our opinion, A/C.1/76/L.55 calls into question the traditional support my country has given to important issues to avoid proliferation, which is why we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Chile has always maintained a principled foreign policy, especially in matters of non-proliferation and disarmament, and in particular with regard to dual-use materials and export controls. Consistent with the foregoing, we have prepared a draft domestic bill that creates the Strategic Trade Commission Regulating the Export of Dual-Use and Defence Materials, which will soon be submitted to the legislative process.

Chile endorses the prevailing multilateral system in this matter, namely, treaties and agreements currently in force, and we believe that we must remain dedicated to them. Obligations in the field of non-proliferation must therefore be promoted, respected and complied with. In this regard, Chile commends the existing multilateral export-control regime for its efforts aimed at contributing to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, delivery systems and advanced conventional weapons through national implementation of export-control guidelines and lists, specifically of

four existing bodies: the Wassenaar Arrangement, the Nuclear Suppliers Group, the Australia Group, and the Missile Technology Control Regime.

We stress that we will always support multilateral non-proliferation regimes because they establish export-control standards and promote robust dual-use-technology controls in pursuit of regional stability. Furthermore, such regimes complement the obligations of States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Biological Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Chile believes that the NPT is the cornerstone of the disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation regime, and we stress the importance of achieving the universalization and implementation of the three pillars that give the Treaty its fundamental structure, namely, disarmament, non-proliferation and the right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy. For this reason, we want all international cooperation and export controls to be delivered within the framework of the NPT.

Mr. Choffat (Switzerland): I take the floor to explain Switzerland's votes with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 entitled "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security".

Switzerland voted against the draft resolution as whole and against the operative paragraphs that were put to a vote. Switzerland is fully committed to maintaining and strengthening the existing global non-proliferation architecture, including through its active participation in all relevant export-control regimes.

Switzerland would like to recall that parties to such treaties as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and their Destruction and the Chemical Weapons Convention have an obligation to ensure that they do not transfer weapons of mass destruction, either directly or indirectly, or in any way assist anyone in acquiring them. At the same time, parties are committed to facilitating international cooperation and trade in related sensitive goods for peaceful purposes. We consider export-control regimes to be a key contribution to the achievement of both of those objectives and therefore to the enhancement of international peace and stability, as well as to the

implementation of Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) and the related embargoes.

Switzerland believes that existing international export-control regimes and strict national export controls on arms and dual-use goods are the best means to strike a balance between, on the one hand, preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including their means of delivery, as well as destabilizing accumulations of conventional weapons, and, on the other hand, enabling and safeguarding international cooperation and trade for peaceful purposes. In our view, operative paragraphs 2 and 3 wrongly challenge this system and risk undermining the effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy of export-control regimes. We therefore cannot support this counterproductive draft resolution.

Switzerland is looking forward to continued cooperation with China as a participating Government in the Nuclear Suppliers Group. Furthermore, as future Chair of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) for the period 2022-2023, Switzerland is pleased to continue to support the Regime's outreach activities, which enhance the understanding of the MTCR and its guidelines among non-participating States.

Mr. Rice-Howell (United Kingdom): I have the honour to deliver this explanation of vote on behalf of France, the United States and my own country, the United Kingdom, on the draft resolution entitled "Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament" (A/C.1/76/L.6).

We supported A/C.1/76/L.6 because we believe that this draft resolution appropriately recognizes international efforts aimed at understanding the benefits and challenges of the development of science and technology in the field of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. The draft resolution rightfully highlights the need for continued collective action to remain closely informed about the latest scientific and technological developments and recognizes the importance of international mechanisms to regulate the transfer of sensitive technologies for peaceful uses. It is only through the development and strengthening of these mechanisms as technology evolves that we can preserve the free flow of technology while also addressing the risk of proliferation by States or non-State actors.

The ongoing discussions of this issue in many forums, inter alia, the Convention on Certain

Conventional Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction (BWC) and the Conference on Disarmament, have served to ensure continued compliance with non-proliferation obligations under international law, enabling progress on disarmament and enhancing international security.

While recognizing the benefits of this draft resolution, we also want to underscore that the rights referred to in the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution are those noted in specific provisions of a limited number of treaties— the CWC, the BWC and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. As the fifth preambular paragraph makes clear, States must exercise those rights in accordance with their international obligations, including their obligations under those three treaties. As States parties to those treaties, the United Kingdom, the United States and France will comply with their respective international obligations and expect all other States parties to do the same. It should be added that none of the three treaties recognizes a right to technologies or a right to sensitive materials.

Mrs. Narayanan Nair (India): India takes this opportunity to explain its votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/76/L.55 and A/C.1/76/L.13.

On draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”, India supports the important role international cooperation in science and technology for peaceful purposes plays in facilitating the economic and social development of States Members of the United Nations, particularly developing countries. We also recognize various provisions contained in international treaties and mandatory obligations relating to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including to non-State actors, which require regulation of relevant transfers. Countries, including sponsors themselves, exercise such controls on exports at the national level. There is a need for due and careful recognition of the factors at play and their respective objectives. Undue tinkering with this balance may be fraught with risks. We therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55.

India welcomes the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13. India co-sponsored the draft

resolution as it, together with the recent adoption of the consensus final reports of the Open-ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security and of the sixth Group of Governmental Experts, creates a constructive and positive multilateral environment to carry forward the dialogue on use and security of information and communications technologies among Member States.

Apart from recognizing the important work done by the Open-ended Working Group and the previous Groups of Governmental Experts, the draft resolution also ensures that their outcomes form the basis for the Open-ended Working Group on security of and in the use of information and communications technologies (2020-2025), thereby preserving the considerable body of work done by these groups. India welcomes this approach. We also look forward to the continuation in coming days of this constructive approach in the new Open-ended Working Group so as to build on the foundation laid by the successful conclusion of the United Nations-mandated dialogue processes in 2021 that have addressed the challenges faced by Member States in the information and communications technologies domain.

Mr. Nugroho (Indonesia): Our delegation takes the floor to explain its positions on the draft resolutions under this cluster.

On draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.16, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”, Indonesia reaffirms the urgency for all States to comply fully with their non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments. The new qualifier “applicable” in operative paragraph 6 should not be used to apply conditionality or limitations to such compliance, especially with regard to the disarmament obligations and commitments under Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW)— two treaties that complement one another.

In view of the upcoming NPT Review Conference, as well as the first Meeting of States Parties to the TPNW, Indonesia calls for all States to redouble their efforts in complying with their commitments and obligations to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, our delegation deems it crucial that the next iteration of this draft resolution should also include

an operational paragraph on verification. As stated in the preamble of the draft, verification and compliance are integrally related.

On draft resolution A/C.1/76/L. 55, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”, Indonesia supports the draft because it is in line with our principled positions. Export-control regimes, which influence all States Members of the United Nations, should be established through multilateral, inclusive and transparent processes. We understand that different views remain on many issues, including the notion of “undue restrictions”. Like many other States, Indonesia is not a party to any export-control regimes. We will therefore approach these differences carefully and refrain from making premature judgments. Instead, we call on all States to make use of the platform for deliberation provided in the draft resolution to improve our mutual understanding.

We want to underscore that our discussion should be open, inclusive and transparent. Indonesia will continue assessing its future position on the basis that the development of this draft resolution will serve both non-proliferation and development objectives in a balanced manner.

Mr. Hwang (France) (*spoke in French*): The United Kingdom and France wish to explain their position on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.24, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”.

France and the United Kingdom joined the consensus on this draft resolution. We support effective and concrete links between disarmament issues and development policy, particularly in the areas of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. That said, we feel it necessary to clarify our position on other aspects of the text.

The notion of a “symbiotic relationship” between disarmament and development seems to us to be questionable, as the conditions for effective arms control and disarmament do not necessarily depend on development alone, as evidenced by the increased military expenditures of some developing countries. There is no automatic link between the two, but rather a complex relationship, which this notion does not accurately capture. Furthermore, the idea that military spending directly diverts funds from development needs should be qualified, as defence investments are

also necessary to ensure the peace and security that facilitates development, especially through legitimate military operations, peacekeeping and improved response to natural disasters, including the need for air and maritime assets.

The United Kingdom and France would like to explain their position on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.26, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”, on which they joined the consensus. We wish to make clear that France and the United Kingdom operate under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. We see no direct connection, as stated in the draft resolution, between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control.

Climate change is among the most serious challenges facing our world. It poses a threat to the environment, global security and economic prosperity. In this respect, the United Kingdom and France are strongly committed to the fight against climate change. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change constitute our common road maps to transform our economies and our energy models. We reaffirm our attachment to the full implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement, as well as our determination to intensify our efforts to live up to our ambitions and responsibilities towards future generations.

Mr. Leite Novaes (Brazil): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”.

Brazil fully supports the purpose of guaranteeing the inalienable right of all States to the peaceful uses of science and technology, as enshrined in the draft resolution. For that reason, we voted in favour of operative paragraphs 2 and 3. However, our abstention on the draft resolution as a whole stems from concerns about language present elsewhere in the text, which could be interpreted as a rebuke to the legitimacy of informal export-control regimes.

Brazil is a member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group and of the Missile Technology Control Regime and has efficient domestic legislation relating to export control of dual-use technologies. Brazil recognizes the importance of the contribution of such regimes

and the national control mechanisms associated with them to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to forestall access by non-State actors to such weapons and their related technologies.

Other delegations that share those concerns have proposed amendments aiming at making the draft more balanced. Brazil regrets that such proposals could not be incorporated into the draft, which led us to our decision to abstain.

We hope that these concerns will be taken into account at the next session of the General Assembly so that we can join the supporters of this initiative.

Ms. Crittenberger (United States of America): The United States of America submits this explanation of position on two resolutions in cluster 5: A/C.1/76/L.24, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”, and A/C.1/76/L.26, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”.

The United States did not participate in the First Committee’s action on either draft resolution. The United States believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues. Accordingly, we do not consider ourselves bound by the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development that was adopted in September 1987.

Similarly, the United States sees no direct connection as set forth in A/C.1/76/L.26 between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control and does not consider this matter germane to the First Committee. The United States operates under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements.

Ms. Yee (Singapore): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation’s vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”. The draft resolution that we have just adopted is compatible with the existing international arrangements for non-proliferation.

Singapore remains fully committed to the goal of non-proliferation. An effective non-proliferation regime requires cooperation on multiple levels, including at the global and regional levels. As responsible members

of the international community, we must cooperate to establish a robust global export-control regime to guard against illicit trafficking without hampering legitimate trade between countries. In our view, discussions on this topic at the United Nations will complement the ongoing work of existing export-control regimes and contribute to the strengthening of the global non-proliferation regime.

Mr. Dang (Viet Nam): Viet Nam supports all efforts on non-proliferation and disarmament in relation to weapons of mass destruction. Viet Nam is party to all treaties with the highest international standards on non-proliferation and disarmament.

My delegation voted in favour the draft resolution entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security” (A/C.1/76/L.55), as it contains several important principles, such the reaffirmation of the need for all States Members of the United Nations to fulfil their obligations on arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation. The draft resolution also recognizes the rights of all States, including developing countries, in terms of technological transfer for strictly peaceful purposes.

It is our wish that the international community share a common voice on issues of a principled nature, and which influence the security and development of many countries.

Mr. Guerra (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, submitted by China and entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”, Argentina abstained from the voting for the following reasons.

The control regimes generated outside the General Assembly are the consequence of the impossibility of making progress within the General Assembly, which is the forum par excellence for doing so, and Argentina supports the idea of making progress within the framework of this body. At the same time, and in the absence of agreement on mechanisms or instruments to overcome this problem, we must avoid undermining non-proliferation. In this regard, beyond a consensus on a policy allowing for all countries to have access to the benefits of the development and use of dual-use technology for exclusively peaceful purposes, Argentina would have preferred to discuss the issue. Accordingly, we could not support the draft resolution.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to explain Mexico's position on its having abstained from the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55.

My delegation takes note of this interesting initiative set forth in the draft resolution because it is aimed at promoting the peaceful uses of science and technology in relation to certain types of weapons.

Developments in science and technology should undoubtedly be employed exclusively for peaceful uses that contribute to the sustainable development of all peoples. Mexico defends the inalienable right of all countries to benefit from these advances. Mexico will contribute constructively to the reflection exercise initiated by the Secretary-General, which we hope will integrate all aspects and points of view on this issue. Furthermore, we endorse the following considerations.

First, international cooperation on peaceful uses and the prevention and control of the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as the global framework against terrorism, are protected by both the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, the respective conventions against biological and chemical weapons, as well as the obligations under resolution 1540 (2004). We reaffirm Mexico's unwavering support for those treaties and mechanisms, which underpin the international disarmament and non-proliferation regime.

Secondly, every right is accompanied by obligations. The sharing of science and technology for peaceful purposes must be carried out in accordance with the conventions I referred to. All parties to those instruments have the responsibility to comply with the obligations and commitments set out therein, in accordance with international law.

Finally, voluntary political agreements, such as those derived from multilateral export control regimes, such as the Nuclear Suppliers Group, the Wassenaar Arrangement and the Australia Group, of which Mexico is a member, are a very important complement to our obligations. Those mechanisms have made a very significant contribution to the prevention of proliferation through restrictions to the access to dual-use goods and technologies related to nuclear, biological, chemical and conventional weapons.

For those of us that have voluntarily joined them, those mechanisms have proven their usefulness to

effectively control strategic and sensitive goods, both within our countries and abroad, through measures implemented in a sovereign manner, based on the provisions set out in legally binding instruments, such as the ones mentioned earlier. In that sense, export control regimes contribute decisively to international peace and security and in no way constitute undue restrictions on trade.

We regret that the nature of such regimes are being prejudged even before the Secretary-General submits the report requested in the draft resolution. Given the newness of this proposal, my delegation also believes that more consultations on the issue would have been critical in order to address the concerns of various delegations, including Mexico, and to build the necessary consensus.

For those reasons, and despite the good intentions of the draft resolution, my delegation decided to abstain in the voting.

Mrs. Romero López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): We take the floor in explanation of vote with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.16, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments".

Our delegation once again abstained in the voting, as we believe that the United States does not have moral standing to promote a text on that matter in the First Committee, since it fails to comply with disarmament architecture, arms control and non-proliferation commitments and agreements and has withdrawn from other agreements, such as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran.

The United States, the only country that has ever utilized a nuclear weapon, does not abide by the letter or the spirit of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and neither does it honour the commitments reached at subsequent Review Conferences, even as it maintains a nuclear posture that seeks to modernize and increase its nuclear arsenals and has a low threshold for their use, including in response to non-nuclear strategic attacks, and contemplates the possibility to carry out explosive nuclear tests in order to ensure the safety and effectiveness of its arsenal.

The United States was the country that, in 2001, blocked the adoption of a legally binding protocol to enhance the Biological Weapons Convention, and it is the country that impedes the full, effective and

non-discriminatory implementation of Article X, on international cooperation for peaceful purposes, by employing unilateral coercive measures. Through such measures, it also limits the implementation of Article XI of the Chemical Weapons Convention, with regard to the economic and technological development of States. The United States is also the only State party to the Convention that has not completed the destruction of its declared arsenals, in flagrant violation of the letter and spirit of the Convention.

The United States promotes conflicts and non-conventional wars in all regions of the planet. Its conduct undermines the disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation architecture.

Mrs. González Hernández (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to make some brief comments with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”.

Uruguay voted in favour of the draft resolution because its objective is to strike a fair balance between the rights and obligations of States with regard to non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of technology. The text considers a series of legitimate aspirations related to the need to access new technologies as a critical support for development.

However, Uruguay wishes to reaffirm its firm commitment to the principle of non-proliferation and international security. As a peace-loving country that respects international law, Uruguay attaches great importance to the development of a regulatory system in order to monitor and prevent technologies that can be used for military purposes. It is incumbent upon the international community to maintain consensus on the principle of non-proliferation and the mechanisms to ensure it.

The peaceful use of technology in the framework of international security requires a balanced monitoring system that prevents access to technology that could lead to non-peaceful purposes. In that connection, we note that the text includes certain concepts that must be further fleshed out in order to achieve a more harmonious draft resolution that garners the broadest possible support among the members of the Organization.

Uruguay therefore expresses its willingness to continue to working on this issue of great importance

to the entire international community. That will require a broad and inclusive consultation process.

Ms. Kesse Antwi (Ghana): Ghana wishes to explain its vote after the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”.

Ghana just now voted in favour of the draft resolution because, as a country that has been operating an atomic energy commission for nearly five decades, we believe that the inalienable rights of States parties to the development and peaceful application of nuclear technology must not be diminished.

In that respect, while we recognize the sovereign rights of each State party to design its own security agenda, we also believe that such an agenda must be confined within the provisions of the non-proliferation regime. Ghana understands the intent of the sponsors of the draft resolution as seeking to promote peaceful uses of technology to be in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological Weapons Convention, as well as other relevant or related international instruments.

Ghana believes, however, that the promotion of peaceful uses of technology is not — and should not be considered — an opening to the development of new weapons of mass destruction or the modification of existing ones, which, in any case, must conform with non-proliferation obligations.

As a non-nuclear-weapon State, Ghana reaffirms its position that the path to a nuclear-weapon free world runs through the complete, verifiable and irreversible disarmament of nuclear weapons by all States and the legally binding prohibition of nuclear weapons. We reiterate that the possession of nuclear weapons does not ensure peace or international security.

Ms. Almojuela (Philippines): We would like to deliver an explanation of vote of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”.

The multilateral disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control regime is an important component of the rules-based international order that has underpinned global peace, security and stability since the founding of the United Nations. Its integrity and credibility rests

on structures developed over time through expert-driven processes.

The Philippines remains committed to that regime. It operates on the understanding that the regime does not, and should not, unduly restrain international cooperation and trade on peaceful uses of technology. Calls for more inclusivity and transparency in that regard are constructive only when the objective is to confirm and continue to uphold such an understanding.

The Philippines appreciated the draft resolution in the context of collective efforts to strengthen the current framework for international cooperation on peaceful uses, on the one hand, and non-proliferation on the other. As a country that implements a strategic trade management framework, we are of the view that export control regimes do not place undue restrictions on international cooperation on peaceful uses and, instead, concretely uphold our non-proliferation obligations. For that reason, we abstained in the voting on operative paragraphs 2 and 3, as well as on the draft resolution, as a whole.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security, and advancing responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies”, put forward by Russia and the United States and which we sponsored, we welcome efforts to harmonize their respective draft resolutions on the subject in order to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the work of the First Committee, thereby leading to credible and collective action that addresses outstanding issues on disarmament and peace and security in a timely manner.

The Chair (*spoke in French*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting on measures under cluster 5, “Other disarmament measures and international security.” The Committee will now turn to cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security”.

First, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to make either a general statement or to introduce new or revised drafts under cluster 6. I would like to remind speakers to be brief when presenting their general statements or explanations of vote so that we can conclude our debate on cluster 6 and move to cluster 7 in a timely manner.

I give the floor to the representative of Algeria to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.37.

Mr. Khaldi (Algeria): I have the honour to formally introduce draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.37, entitled “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”, submitted by the Algerian delegation after a technical rollover and some substantive amendments.

Deriving from Algeria’s principled commitment to achieving disarmament and strengthening security, both regionally and globally, the primary objective of the draft resolution is to contribute to the various efforts to make the Mediterranean region peaceful and stable through the intensification of dialogue and consultations among countries of the region with a view to resolving existing problems and further developing regional cooperation.

Not only does the text address the issue of disarmament via stronger cooperation in the fields of combating terrorism in all its forms, tackling international crimes and combating illicit arms transfers and drug production, it also addresses the improvement of the political, socioeconomic and human rights situation in the countries of the region based on ownership through national and regional efforts. The text, which, until 2018, had been adopted by consensus since its inception, almost four decades ago, with the continuous and strong support of the countries of the region and beyond, remains fully in line with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, to which we Member States have all adhered.

In that regard, I wish to commend and thank those Member States that have regularly participated in order to enrich the Secretary-General’s report on this issue by sharing their national perspectives and contributions to the security of the Mediterranean region.

The 2018 vote on this draft resolution, notably on its operative paragraphs 2 and 5, as well as on the draft resolution as a whole, was an unfortunate setback that we tried to remedy through explanations, exchanges and dialogue, but ultimately the resolution calls on the countries of the region willing to engage in the collective efforts related to disarmament and, more broadly, peace. Having carefully listened to the explanations of vote made on operative paragraphs 2 and 5 of the draft resolution, my delegation this year tried to accommodate the concerns raised by the delegations by inserting some substantive amendments to balance the language of both operative paragraphs.

In operative paragraph 2, we have envisaged a broader call on the Mediterranean countries to consolidate their efforts in order to contribute to the elimination of all sources of tension in the region. In operative paragraph 5, we proposed to highlight the importance for all countries of the Mediterranean region adhering to the multilaterally negotiated legal instrument related to disarmament and non-proliferation.

However, our call to restore consensus on this draft resolution was unfortunately not heard, and we regret that the same call for a vote has again been requested despite the inclusive and constructive approach that guided the amendments proposed by my delegation during the current session.

In that respect, my delegation expresses its hope that this draft resolution will garner the traditional, unanimous support it has always received within the First Committee. We therefore call on all delegations to vote in favour of those paragraphs and of the draft resolution, as a whole.

Mr. Mohd Nasir (Malaysia): Through this brief general statement under cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security”, Malaysia wishes to underscore the importance of the nuclear-weapon free zones in enhancing global and regional peace. As a founding member of the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) Treaty, also known as the Bangkok Treaty, Malaysia strongly reaffirms the Treaty’s paramount importance as the primary disarmament and non-proliferation instrument in the region of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

Although the Treaty has been in force for over two decades, its Protocol has yet to be signed by any of the nuclear-weapon States. We must therefore urgently resolve all outstanding issues in accordance with the objectives and principles of the SEANWFZ Treaty pertaining to the signing and ratification of the Treaty’s Protocol at the earliest possible time. That is in line with the aspirations of the ASEAN leaders, as enshrined in the ASEAN Political-Security Community Blueprint 2025.

To that end and as a way forward, ASEAN member States should begin open and constructive dialogues with the nuclear-weapon States in order to address their concerns and reservations, as agreed every year by the ASEAN Foreign Ministers. It is vital that ASEAN member States collectively make progress and reach an

agreement on the submission of the biennial SEANWFZ draft resolution to the seventy-eighth session of the First Committee in 2023, following the last substantive submission six years ago, in 2015.

Ms. Almojuela (Philippines): The international and regional components of the global governance regime are equally important to the enduring stability of the rules-based international order. This principle holds true in the area of disarmament and security.

Regional dynamics and the development of mechanisms and institutions to manage regional security architecture should inform the development of international norms. In our region, the centrality of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and ASEAN-led mechanisms — whether in the area of implementing the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty, addressing chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear threats or pursuing humanitarian mine action — has facilitated confidence-building and regional cooperation in a manner that is inclusive and responsive to region-specific challenges.

By supporting draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.21, on regional disarmament, the Philippines affirms that global and regional approaches to disarmament complement each other and should therefore be pursued simultaneously in order to promote regional and international peace and security. That complementarity, however, is a two-way street. Regional measures must also be complemented with adherence to global norms and frameworks.

In the area of nuclear weapons, the Philippines therefore underscores that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons remains the cornerstone of the global disarmament, non-proliferation and peaceful-uses regime. We call on all parties to accede to the Treaty and to engage in meaningful dialogue towards a world without nuclear weapons.

The Chair (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer.

Mr. Dvořák (European Union): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. Turkey, the Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ukraine and the Republics of Moldova and Georgia align themselves with this statement.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.37, entitled “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”, the EU would like to state the following. We take note of the changes to paragraphs 2 and 5 in this year’s text. Notably, paragraph 5 highlights the importance for all countries of the Mediterranean region to adhere to the relevant multilaterally negotiated legal instruments related to the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, thereby creating the conditions necessary for strengthening peace and cooperation in the region.

We would like to underline that the reference to “relevant legal instruments” includes, in our view, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), which, regrettably, has not yet entered into force. Promoting the universalization and the early entry into force of the CTBT are among the EU’s top priorities. All 27 EU member States have ratified the Treaty and remain strongly committed to pursuing the achievement of its objectives. The EU has also continued to provide significant financial support for the activities of the Preparatory Commission of the CTBT Organization in order to strengthen its monitoring and verification capabilities. One example of the EU member States’ continued active engagement is that the EU has become a supporter of 10 actions of the Secretary-General’s agenda for disarmament, including Action 4 “Bring the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty into force”. In that context, we will devote attention to promoting universalization and the entry into force of the CTBT.

The EU reiterates its call for all States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the CTBT without preconditions or delay. In particular, we address that call to the remaining eight annex 2 States, whose ratification is essential for the Treaty’s entry into force. We welcome the latest ratifications, by Cuba and the Comoros, increasing the number of ratifications to 170 States. Pending the Treaty’s entry into force, we call upon all States to maintain moratoriums on nuclear-explosive tests and other nuclear explosions and to refrain from any action that would undermine the Treaty’s object and purpose. The EU calls on the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea to refrain from testing nuclear weapons, to implement a full moratorium on all types of ballistic-missile launches and to sign and ratify the CTBT without delay.

Nuclear-explosive tests and other nuclear explosions represent a serious threat to international peace and security and undermine the global non-proliferation

regime. It is important that all State signatories adhere to the objectives of the Treaty. The use of on-site inspections, an important verification tool, is possible only after the CTBT’s entry into force. Only then can the Treaty outlaw nuclear-explosive tests and other nuclear explosions in a binding and verifiable way. We will therefore continue to use every opportunity to advocate the Treaty’s ratification and universalization, including during this First Committee session.

The Chair (*spoke in French*): There are no other delegations wishing to make general statements, and therefore before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions and decisions under cluster 6.

In the absence of any requests from delegations wishing to explain their votes or positions, the Committee will now move to taking action on those drafts.

(*spoke in English*)

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.22, entitled “Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.22 was submitted on 8 October by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.22.

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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia,

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, 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, Vanuatu, 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, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.22 was adopted by 135 votes to 3, with 46 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.30, entitled "Regional disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.30 was submitted on 11 October by the representative of Pakistan. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.30. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE

portal of the First Committee. Sri Lanka has also become a sponsor.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.30 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.31, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.31 was submitted on 11 October by the representative of Pakistan. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.31. 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.1/76/L.31. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote first, one by one.

I first put to the vote the seventh preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

India, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Guinea-Bissau, Somalia, Zimbabwe

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 167 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, 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, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica,

Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 116 votes to 1, with 55 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.31, 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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina,

Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, 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, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Russian Federation, Somalia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.31, as a whole, was adopted by 179 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.32, entitled "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.32 was submitted on 11 October by the representative of Pakistan. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.32. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Cameroon has also become a sponsor.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.32 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.37, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.37 was submitted on 12 October by the representative of Algeria. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.37. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 2 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.37.

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

I 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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia,

Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, 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:

None

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 169 votes to 2.

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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, 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:

Ireland

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.37, as a whole. 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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, 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, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, 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, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Israel, Somalia

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.37, as a whole, was adopted by 176 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair (*spoke in French*): I shall now give the floor to delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions and decisions just adopted

I would greatly appreciate it if delegations could be brief in their explanations so that we can conclude on time.

Mr. Balouji (Iran): I take the floor to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.37, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

Iran voted in favour of operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution, which calls for the elimination of all causes of tension in the region along with the promotion of just and lasting solutions to its persistent problems.

More important, our support for this paragraph is based on its call to ensure the withdrawal of foreign forces of occupation while respecting the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all countries of the region as well as the right of the peoples to self-determination, including full adherence to the principles of the non-use or threat of use of force and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. Those are basic principles of international law and enjoy our strong support.

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

However, my delegation did not participate in the action on the draft resolution as a whole, as it did not factually reflect the realities in the region or 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.

Ms. Narayanan Nair (India): India wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.31, “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”.

India voted against A/C.1/76/L.31 as well as 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. The Conference, as the world’s single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has the vocation of negotiating disarmament instruments of global application.

In 1993, the United Nations Disarmament Commission adopted by consensus guidelines and recommendations on regional disarmament. There is no need, therefore, for the Conference on Disarmament to engage itself in formulating principles on the same subject at a time when it has several other priority issues on its agenda.

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

It is for that reason that India voted against the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.31.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.31, on conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels.

We cannot agree with the formulation of the seventh preambular paragraph, because it mentions the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty, signed in 1990, which in our view has long been obsolete. It is no longer relevant or effective.

The Russian Federation initiated discussions on adaptation of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty and ratified the relevant agreement. We deplore the fact that, unfortunately, the measures undertaken by the Russian Federation were rejected by NATO member States, which did not even endeavour

to ratify the adaptation agreement. As a result, in 2007 the Russian Federation adopted a decision to suspend the Treaty and in 2015 ceased participating in meetings of the Joint Consultative Group, thereby concluding the process of withdrawing its membership from the Treaty.

However, the Russian Federation stands ready to work in a concerted manner on a new conventional arms control regime in Europe that would reflect the interests of both the Russian Federation and other European states.

Moreover, our delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which requests that the Conference on Disarmament consider the matter of developing principles that can serve as a basis for regional agreements on conventional arms control. We do not view as judicious consideration of conventional arms control in the forum of the Conference on Disarmament insofar as its mandate includes the conduct of negotiations on a legally binding treaty, not the development of any principles. We proceed from the premise that a more appropriate forum for this would be the United Nations Disarmament Commission, whose specific purview includes the introduction of recommendations on various disarmament and arms-control issues.

Mr. Moreno (Israel): I wish to speak in explanation of vote after the voting on resolution A/C.1/76/L.37, “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”, with respect to operative paragraphs 2 and 5, as they do not truly reflect the reality in the Middle East.

With regard to operative paragraph 2, while peace in the Mediterranean is the ultimate goal of the State of Israel, that one-dimensional paragraph is misleading. There is no mention of the ongoing use of chemical weapons by Syria. There is no mention of the ongoing missile proliferation by Iran. There is no mention of the terror unleashed by Iran. There is no mention of the radical groups and non-State actors that are terrorizing the whole region, including the Mediterranean.

On operative paragraph 5, Israel believes that joining arms-control treaties is not an aim or a goal by itself. Real solutions cannot be found if countries do not abide by their obligations or if they do not actually solve regional issues. Israel believes that it is time to face reality for what it is.

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

Before the Committee takes action on the draft resolutions and decisions under cluster 7, we will hear any delegations wishing to make general statements on those drafts.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The United Nations plays a leadership role in the consideration of arms-control, disarmament and non-proliferation matters as well as matters related to international peace and security. Moreover, it is specifically States Members of the United Nations that have the prerogative of charting a course for concerted efforts in that area. Only through inclusive consideration of modern-day threats and challenges through the concerted quest for ways to resolve pressing issues in the area of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation and through the unanimous approval of recommendations and measures to address the situation can guidance for action be adopted that is legitimate in terms of accounting for the views of all States.

Given the fact that the arms-control, disarmament and non-proliferation architecture has deteriorated, the international community should mobilize to safeguard and fine-tune it. Measures to strengthen existing arms-control regimes and to develop new ones must be undertaken through the already existing convention mechanisms or through the United Nations disarmament mechanism. Each component of that mechanism, specifically the First Committee, the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament, is designed to responsibly and effectively carry out the functions designated to it. We, the States Members of the United Nations, are called upon to provide the necessary conditions for this as well as to strictly comply with their mandates. There is an urgent need to avoid any politicization of their activities to the detriment of seeking consensus-based solutions to pressing issues in arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation, and also to focus efforts on creating a constructive atmosphere. Absent that, consensus cannot be achieved on any agreement.

Indeed consensus and consensus-based agreement in such sensitive areas as arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation that can be viewed as reliable and effective. Where there is consensus, the security interests of all stakeholders are taken into account. Of late, we have been particularly troubled by the trends

of delegations' attention being diverted from matters of substance to secondary matters. We believe that this is a nefarious practice.

In that regard, a regrettable situation that has unfolded around the Conference on Disarmament. Nearly half of the meetings of the 2021 session were dedicated to a discussion of matters unrelated to its agenda. Furthermore, we have been witnessing attempts by a number of States to reconsider the rules of procedure for the Conference. Apparently, that would help to surmount all the obstacles on the path to normalizing the work of the forum and would help it to transition towards negotiations.

The Russian Federation has adopted a principled position in that regard. Our view is that the States members of the Conference on Disarmament must have all of the necessary tools, that is, rules of procedure and established practice, to effectively tackle the questions on the agenda.

The principles set out in the mandate of the Conference, first and foremost the role of consensus, are inviolable. They are of paramount importance in terms of devising effective arms-control and disarmament agreements. States participating in the Conference should prioritize a concerted quest for mutually acceptable solutions on a comprehensive and balanced programme of work. The United Nations Disarmament Commission has a unique niche in the United Nations disarmament system. The Commission is necessary as a platform where States Members of the United Nations to reach a common understanding and agree to practical recommendations.

Ms. Almojuela (Philippines): We welcome the resolutions and the mandates of the regional centres for peace and disarmament to promote the activities of the United Nations to strengthen peace, security and stability at the regional level and to provide, on request, substantive support for the initiatives and other activities mutually agreed upon by Member States for the implementation of measures for peace and disarmament.

We believe that regional institutions play an indispensable role in enriching the discourse and reinforcing norms on disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control and in support of dynamic and inclusive multilateral processes that are rooted in the region.

We welcome decision A/C.1/76/L.33, on the Disarmament Commission. The substantive issues that we need to address at the United Nations Disarmament Commission are inordinately important in pursuing the Commission's mandate of resolving issues of disarmament and international peace and security, including the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction.

We reiterate our view there are legitimate reasons to question the non-issuance of visas to certain representatives to the Disarmament Commission, considering the relevant provisions of the 1947 United Nations Headquarters Agreement. It should be noted, however, that visa issuance is also a sovereign right. Ultimately, the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission must proceed and not be compromised further by this issue, which is consular and bilateral in origin.

The Chairman (*spoke in French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

The Committee will now proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.18/Rev.1, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.18 was submitted by the representative of Nepal on 8 October. Subsequently, a revised draft resolution was submitted on 25 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.18/Rev.1. The additional co-sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Sri Lanka has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.18/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.21, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.21 was submitted by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States on 8 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.21. The additional co-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. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.21 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.25, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.25 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 8 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.25.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.25 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.28, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.28 was submitted on 8 October by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.28.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it

without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.28 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/76/L.33, entitled “Disarmament Commission”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/76/L.33 was submitted on 12 October by the representative of Australia. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.33.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/76/L.33 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.38, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.38 was submitted on 12 October by the representative of Peru on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.38.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.38 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.48, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.48 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of Chile. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.48.

The Chair: The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.48 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.61, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.61 was submitted on 15 October by the representative of Burundi on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Economic Community of Central African States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.61.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.61 was adopted.

The Chair (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the delegations wishing to speak in explanation of position on the draft resolutions and decisions just adopted.

Mr. Mohd Nasir (Malaysia): Malaysia joined consensus on all draft resolutions and the draft decision on which the First Committee just took action under cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”.

Malaysia remains an ardent proponent of multilateralism in the pursuit of general and complete disarmament. We strongly believe in the need for reinvigorating the United Nations disarmament machinery, including the First Committee, the Conference on Disarmament and the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC). Doing so would add further impetus to ongoing efforts pertaining to various disarmament and non-proliferation issues.

Malaysia is of the view that the Conference on Disarmament needs to assert its relevance as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum of the international community. The current deadlock in the Conference on Disarmament undermines the credibility of the Conference and erodes the trust of

the international community in disarmament. In order to realize that goal, Malaysia will continue to engage constructively in the Conference on Disarmament to pursue an agreed programme of work. Malaysia is of the view that it is vital for Member States to exercise flexibility in order to rejuvenate these stalled multilateral negotiations.

Malaysia reaffirms the relevance and importance of the Disarmament Commission as the sole specialized and deliberative body within the multilateral disarmament machinery. It is unfortunate that the UNDC has been unable to hold a substantive session for two consecutive years — 2019 and 2020. With the adoption just now by the First Committee of the draft decision on the Disarmament Commission, it is hoped that the Commission will hold a substantive session from 5 to 22 April 2022 and submit a substantive report to the General Assembly at its seventy-seventh session. That is especially pertinent because of the pressing and uncertain global geopolitical dynamics.

Our collective efforts, readiness and willingness to preserve, protect and defend the disarmament machinery, including the First Committee, the Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission, are required. They belong to all of us because the world cannot afford anything less.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation joined the consensus on document A/C.1/76/L.33. At the same time, we believe that there is a need to set out our position with respect to the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

The Russian Federation reaffirms the ongoing need for the Disarmament Commission as an important component of the disarmament triad. The Commission allows for a detailed analysis of key disarmament and arms-control matters and allows for the relevant recommendations to be submitted for the General Assembly.

We highly value the results of the work of the Disarmament Commission in 2018. We believe that of the primary aims of the Commission is to continue a substantive discussion on the matter of nuclear disarmament and transparency-increasing and trust-building measures in space activities, with the aim of preventing an arms race in outer space.

We note with regret that there have been organizational problems, including those related to the failure of the United States authorities to issue a

visa to the Head of the Russian interagency delegation, which led to delays in the Commission's activities in 2019 and 2020. All matters that prevent the full-fledged operations of the Commission need to be resolved definitively, and non-discriminatory access to United Nations headquarters in New York needs to be provided to all States Members of the United Nations, in line with the obligations of the United States under the 1947 Headquarters Agreement.

The Chair (*spoke in French*): As delegations are aware, the Committee is expected to complete its work today, 3 November. Delegations should also recall that the Committee was unable to complete its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.58, under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons", and A/C.1/76/L.54, under cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction". Given the time constraints facing the Committee and the fact that delegations have already had an opportunity to explain their votes under the respective thematic clusters, I would like to propose that the Committee consider the two remaining draft proposals in a format combining clusters 1 and 2. This means that delegations will have an opportunity to make general statements and explanation of votes before action on the two draft proposals, which will be considered one after the other. If I hear no objections, we shall proceed accordingly.

It was so decided.

The Chair (*spoke in French*): The First Committee will now turn to take action on the remaining draft proposals under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons", and cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction", in accordance with the decision that has just been taken.

I now give the floor to delegations wishing to make a general statement, provide a new text or a revised text under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons", or cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction". Statements should not exceed five minutes, but I will be extremely grateful if those statements were less than five minutes.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation has brought before the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.54, entitled "Secretary-General's Mechanism for Investigation of Alleged Use of Chemical and Biological Weapons", for its consideration. The draft resolution is geared towards ensuring effective harnessing of the Secretary-General's Mechanism as a tool in the area of international chemical and biological security, and the Russian Federation notes the need for the international

community to undertake, with the support of the United Nations, efforts to boost the expert and technical capacity of the Mechanism.

Greater interest in pursuing this work in a manner reflective of the views of Member States was affirmed to us by the Secretary-General himself with regard to the practical use of the Secretary-General's Mechanism. Of great significance are the guidelines and procedures contained in annex I of document A/44/561, as endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 45/57 C, on 4 December 1990.

More than 30 years ago, the guidelines and procedures, which were developed first and foremost from a technical standpoint, are largely at odds with present-day realities in terms of the investigation of incidents of use of chemical and biological weapons. A host of technical and methodological innovations have emerged, and these innovations could help to enhance the effectiveness of the Secretary-General's Mechanism, which is a point set out, inter alia, in annex II of the 2013 final report of the last mission conducted through the Secretary-General's Mechanism (A/68/663), which independently finetuned its working methods on the basis of existing instruction materials from the World Health Organization and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

With a view to further strengthening the Secretary-General's Mechanism, the Russian Federation proposed that the views of States Members of the United Nations be solicited with the aim of determining which provisions, principles and procedures might be necessary for the updating the Mechanism and of having the ideas and proposals regarding these changes shared. On the basis of these considerations, the Secretary General would, during the seventy-seventh session of the General Assembly, submit for consideration by the Member States a substantive report with an annex containing these views. At the same time, there would be a presentation of the general views of Member States vis-à-vis the feasibility of enhancing the effectiveness of the Mechanism as a whole.

We call upon States Members of the United Nations to support and co-sponsor the Russian Federation's draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.54, submitted for the Assembly's consideration, on the Secretary-General's Mechanism for Investigation of Alleged Use of Chemical and Biological. Enhancing the effectiveness of the Mechanism would make a considerable contribution

to strengthening international chemical and biological security.

The Chair (*spoke in French*): Before taking action on the draft resolutions, the Committee will now hear delegations wishing to explain their position on the drafts.

Mr. Choffat (Switzerland): I am taking the floor to explain Switzerland's vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/54, entitled "Secretary-General's Mechanism for Investigation of Alleged Use of Chemical and Biological Weapons". My delegation will vote against the draft resolution as a whole, as well as on the separate votes on operative paragraphs 3 and 4. The following considerations underlie our vote.

Switzerland is concerned by the erosion of key arms-control instruments in recent years. We believe that draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.54 could contribute to this trend and in effect weaken the Secretary-General's Mechanism (UNSGM). The UNSGM is the only internationally agreed mechanism for investigating allegations of biological-weapons use. It also serves a valuable function in the area of chemical weapons, where it supports the important work of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. It is a functional, General Assembly-mandated instrument that has proven its value, for example, in the context of the "Sellström" mission in Syria in 2013. The draft resolution would not achieve its stated aim of strengthening the UNSGM but would in fact be counterproductive, as it risks undermining the Mechanism's independence as well as the authority of the Secretary-General.

At its core, the draft resolution, in its operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, calls for a review of the UNSGM's technical guidelines and procedures and for Member States to provide input to this end. In our view, this call is not only unnecessary, but also problematic for the functioning of the Mechanism, as it undermines the established process for updating the guidelines and procedures. If it were considered necessary to review and revise the UNSGM's technical guidelines and procedures, there already exists a clear and established procedure for doing so in paragraph 103 of the guidelines themselves, as contained in annex I of the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/44/561, dated 4 October 1989.

Paragraph 103 calls on the Secretary-General to

"periodically review with the assistance of his appointed expert consultants, bearing in mind

modifications proposed by Member States, these guidelines and procedures and revise them as necessary for submission to the General Assembly, upon its request”.

As becomes evident from this quotation, there is no need to “reiterate” that the Secretary-General should review the guidelines, as contained in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, to “encourage” suggestions from Member States, as contained in operative paragraph 3, or to “request” the Secretary-General to seek their views, as contained in operative paragraph 4 — as all of these elements are already explicitly included in the guidelines themselves. Any Member State wishing to submit suggestions for modification to the guidelines and procedures can do so right now without any need for this draft resolution.

In addition, paragraph 103 clearly stipulates that the Secretary-General, not the General Assembly, should initiate the process of reviewing the guidelines and procedures. Switzerland is therefore of the view that operative paragraph 2 is problematic, as it just suggests that the Secretary-General is not abiding by the provisions of paragraph 103 of the guidelines to periodically review the technical guidelines.

In addition, operative paragraphs 3 and 4 are not only unnecessary for the reasons just outlined, but also in reality question the prerogative of the Secretary-General to initiate and lead the review process. Such an approach would undermine his authority as well as the essential principle of independence, on which the Secretary-General’s Mechanism rests. It is technical and non-political in nature and has been designed in a way to meet those requirements. The Secretary-General’s Mechanism is a valuable tool, the independence of which must be protected and not diminished.

For that reason, Switzerland does not support the draft resolution.

Mr. Eberhardt (United States of America): I take the floor to give an explanation of vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/76/L.54, entitled “Secretary-General’s Mechanism for Investigation of Alleged Use of Chemical and Biological Weapons”.

Like most Member States represented in this room, the United States places great value on preserving the integrity and independence of the Secretary-General’s Mechanism. The use of chemical weapons in recent years, combined with the experience of the coronavirus disease pandemic and the risk that revolutionary

advances in the life sciences might be misused, underscores the need for effective international mechanisms for investigating the possible use of chemical, biological or toxin weapons.

During the 2020 First Committee session, the Russian Federation proposed a draft resolution that would have seriously undermined the Secretary-General’s Mechanism. Fortunately, a cross-regional group of countries defeated that draft resolution by an overwhelming margin. On its face, Russia’s proposed draft resolution this year might appear less contentious, but it would still undermine the integrity, independence and impartial character of the Secretary-General’s Mechanism.

Of greatest concern to the United States are elements of the draft resolution that would launch a formal process for United Nations States Members to critique the guidelines and procedures of the Secretary-General’s Mechanism without a compelling reason and without regard for existing review provisions. Russia has stated that it removed all controversial language from last year’s failed draft resolution; however, the language calling for this review was specifically rejected by the First Committee last year.

The technical guidelines and procedures of the Secretary-General’s Mechanism, which have been endorsed by the General Assembly, already contain a provision for being updated, when and if necessary, drawing on the consulted experts that Member States have nominated to assist the Secretary-General. Any Member State, with or without this draft resolution, can nominate one or more consultant experts, which we encourage all Member States to consider, as well as share its views directly with the Secretary-General.

The guidelines and procedures of the Secretary-General’s Mechanism have functioned well, most recently in the investigation of the use of chemical weapons in Syria in 2013. There is no need to invent a different procedure, especially one that could easily become politicized and weaken the credibility of the Secretary-General’s Mechanism. It is clear that Russia does not intend to stop with this first step of critiquing the technical procedures and guidelines of the Secretary-General’s Mechanism and will continue pressing to steadily strip away the Secretary-General’s prerogative to lead any technical review and update process in an objective manner.

Russia's actions in the First Committee, as well as in other international bodies, clearly show that it continues to seek to undermine the fundamental independence and integrity of the Secretary-General's Mechanism. For example, at the 2021 Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) Meeting of Experts, Russia issued a paper insisting that all requests by BWC States parties — nearly the entire world — must go through the Security Council, where Russia has veto power.

At that meeting, Russia also proposed creating a redundant competing investigatory mechanism. During this year's session of the First Committee, Russia and China presented a joint statement on the BWC that implicitly criticized the Secretary-General's Mechanism as duplicative and infringing upon Security Council prerogatives, while again calling for a competing investigative mechanism.

For those reasons, the United States will vote against the draft resolution as a whole, as well as against operative paragraphs 3 and 4. We strongly encourage other delegations that value maintaining a strong independent Secretary-General's Mechanism to do likewise.

Ms. Ponikvar Velázquez (Slovenia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the States members of the European Union (EU), as well as the Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro, Albania, Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway. Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Georgia, Canada, Australia and the United Kingdom also align themselves with this explanation of vote.

I take the floor to explain our vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/76/L.54, entitled "Secretary-General's Mechanism for Investigation of Alleged Use of Chemical and Biological Weapons". We are not in a position to support the draft resolution and call upon others to vote against the text.

We have taken note with concern of the Russian Federation's proposed draft resolution requesting, notably, that the Secretary-General seek the views of Member States on the need to review the guidelines and procedures of the Secretary-General's Mechanism.

The EU is a staunch and long-standing supporter of the Secretary-General's Mechanism as an independent international instrument to carry out investigations in response to the possible use of chemical, biological or toxin weapons that might constitute a violation of

the 1925 Geneva Protocol or other relevant rules of customary international law.

The EU does not, at this time, see a specific need to update the guidelines and procedures of the Secretary-General's Mechanism, or for the Secretary-General to take a first step in that direction for the following reasons.

First, the draft resolution proposal suggests that the process should be started because certain provisions of the guidelines and procedures of the Secretary-General's Mechanism, which still remain to be identified, should be adapted in the light of scientific and technological developments and since their endorsements by the General Assembly in 1990.

We note that the draft resolution fails to mention the fact that the guidelines and procedures of the Secretary-General's Mechanism were actually reviewed in 2007 and their technical appendices updated the same year. Furthermore, the guidelines and procedures worked adequately in a real-world situation in 2014, when the Secretary-General's Mechanism was launched for the purpose of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons investigation into the alleged use of chemical weapons in Syria. It is therefore unclear why there would be a pressing need at this time to start the process leading to a review of the guidelines and procedures of the Secretary-General's Mechanism.

Secondly, we question the motives behind the proposal. One crucial aspect of the guidelines and procedures of the Secretary-General's Mechanism is that they authorize the Secretary-General to decide autonomously whether to launch an investigation into the alleged use or other cases of violations of customary international law, and separate approval from the Security Council is not needed. The independence of the Secretary-General's Mechanism instrument is a vital guarantee to Member States that, if they request an investigation into the alleged use of chemical or biological weapons, the launch of the investigation cannot be blocked by another Member State due to political motives.

The ulterior motive behind the supposed need to review the guidelines and procedures of the Secretary-General's Mechanism is to subordinate the Secretary-General's Mechanism and, more specifically, the Secretary-General's decision-making power as to whether to launch an investigation into the alleged use of biological weapons to the Security Council.

Finally, at this year's Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) Meeting of Experts, a total of three working papers proposing the establishment of a new mechanism or instruments for the investigation of the alleged use of biological weapons were submitted in view of the nineteenth Review Conference. Incidentally, two of those proposals were submitted by the Russian Federation. We consider it preferable to wait for the results of the BWC Review Conference first before rushing to start the process leading to a possible review of the way the only current existing instrument for the investigation of the alleged use of biological weapons works.

For those reasons, the EU calls on all States not to support the draft resolution, which raises serious concerns in terms of both its format and content.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): We support and will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.54, entitled "Secretary-General's Mechanism for Investigation of Alleged Use of Chemical and Biological Weapons". We attach great importance to the independence of the Mechanism and an inclusive and representative endeavour to review the procedures, as well as one consistent with the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) and the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). The adoption of this initiative will allow the States Members of the United Nations to participate in updating the Mechanism's guidelines and procedures.

The draft resolution contains particularly positive paragraphs, including, inter alia, condemning any use of toxic chemicals, biological agents or toxins as weapons by anyone, anywhere and at any time; holding accountable those responsible for such use; urging all States parties to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC) and the CWC, as a priority, to fully comply with all of their obligations undertaken pursuant to the Conventions; calling upon States parties to the BTWC for continued efforts to strengthen that agreement; and last, but not least, encouraging Member States to share their views on reviewing the related provisions of the Secretary-General's Mechanism for Investigation of Alleged Use of Chemical and Biological Weapons, to be reflected in the report of the Secretary-General.

In addition, we believe that resuming multilateral negotiations to conclude a non-discriminatory legally binding protocol to the BWC dealing with all articles of the Convention in a balanced and comprehensive

manner, inter alia, through effective verification measures, is needed. We hope that this issue, along with other proposals, will be discussed and duly reflected on the next occasion when the draft resolution is presented again.

It is our conviction that the BTWC envisaged that Member States would decide on the handling of any Convention-related issues, therefore the Secretary-General's Mechanism would not be appropriate to utilize in that respect..

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.58, 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 give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.58 was submitted by the representative of Malaysia on 14 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.58. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Sri Lanka and Sierra Leone have also become sponsors.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on the ninth and seventeenth preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.58. We shall now begin the voting process. I shall put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I now put to the vote the ninth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's

Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, 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, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Russian Federation, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iraq, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The ninth preambular paragraph was retained by 138 to 2 with 30 abstentions.

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

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana,

Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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, Zimbabwe

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, Comoros, Djibouti, Finland, Georgia, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine

The seventeenth preambular paragraph was retained by 110 to 36, with 19 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El

Salvador, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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, Zimbabwe

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, Comoros, Djibouti, Finland, Georgia, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 111 to 36, with 17 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.58, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil,

Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, 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, 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, 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, Canada, Chad, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Finland, Georgia, Iceland, India, Japan, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Serbia, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.58, as a whole, was adopted by 131 to 36, with 17 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.54, entitled “Secretary-General’s Mechanism for Investigation of Alleged Use of Chemical and Biological Weapons”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.54 was submitted by the representative of the Russian Federation on 14 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.54. A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution has been issued as document A/C.1/76/L.63 and is available on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.54. We shall now begin the voting process. I shall put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I first put to the vote operative paragraph 3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Cambodia, China, Comoros, Cuba, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Mali, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Chad, Côte d’Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia

Operative paragraph 3 was rejected by 26 votes to 58, with 68 abstentions.

The Chair: I now put to the vote operative paragraph 4.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Cambodia, China, Comoros, Cuba, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Mali, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia

Operative paragraph 4 was rejected by 25 votes to 58, with 68 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.54, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Comoros, Cuba, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Serbia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Tonga, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa

Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.54, as a whole, was rejected by 31 votes to 64, with 77 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.