



General Assembly

Seventy-seventh session

First Committee

31st meeting

Friday, 4 November 2022, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Pieris(Sri Lanka)

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

“Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”.

Agenda items 90 to 108 (continued)

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

The Chair: We will begin by taking action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security”, as contained in informal paper 3, Rev.1.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on all proposals under cluster 6.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/77/L.12, entitled “Maintenance of international security — good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/77/L.12 was submitted by the representative of North Macedonia on 28 September. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.12.

The Chair: The sponsor of the draft decision 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.1/77/L.12 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.24, entitled

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.24 was submitted by the representative of Algeria on 6 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.24. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Eritrea and the Sudan have also become sponsors.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 2 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.24. We shall now begin the voting process. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.24.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt,

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 AB-0601 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

22-67393(E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, 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, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, 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, 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, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.24 was retained by 166 votes to 2, with no abstentions.

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

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.24.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, 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, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, 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, 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, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.24 was retained by 165 votes to 2, with no abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.24, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, 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, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.24, as a whole, was adopted by 172 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.33, entitled "Regional disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.33 was submitted on 10 October by the representative of Pakistan. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.33 are listed in the document. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.33 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.33 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.34, 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.1/77/L.34 was submitted on 10 October by the representative of Pakistan. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.34 are listed in the document. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.34 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.34 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.35, 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.1/77/L.35 was submitted on 11 October by the representative of Pakistan. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.35. 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.1/77/L.35. We shall now begin the voting process. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I shall first put to the vote the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.35.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, 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, 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, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, 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, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

Poland

The seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.35 was retained by 166 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.35.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, 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, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, 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, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern

Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.35 was retained by 115 votes to 1, with 49 abstentions.

The Chair: The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.35, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, 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, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, 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, Türkiye, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.35, as a whole, was adopted by 174 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Shevchenko (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.35 on conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels. We cannot agree with the wording of the seventh preambular paragraph, because it mentions the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE), concluded in 1990, which in our view has long since become obsolete, having lost its effectiveness and relevance. As members know, Russia initiated negotiations on the adaptation of the CFE Treaty and ratified the relevant agreement. However, the efforts that we undertook were rejected by NATO member States, which did not even seek to ratify the adaptation agreement. As a result, Russia adopted a decision to suspend the Treaty in 2007 and has ceased participating in meetings of the Joint Consultative Group since 2015, thereby concluding the

process of withdrawing its membership from the Treaty. Furthermore, our delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, 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”.

We do not view as judicious the 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 but not the development of general principles. We believe that a more appropriate forum for that would be the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the specific purview of which includes the introduction of recommendations on various disarmament and arms control issues.

Mr. Kalmar (Israel): I would like to speak in explanation of vote after the voting on resolution A/C.1/77/L.24, entitled “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”, with respect to operative paragraphs 2 and 5 of the draft resolution, as they do not 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. It does not reflect the reality of the region. There is no reference to the ongoing use of chemical weapons by Syria. There is no reference to the ongoing missile proliferation by Iran. There is no reference to the terror unleashed by Iran. There is no reference to the radical groups and non-State actors that are terrorizing the whole region, including the Mediterranean. With regard to operative paragraph 5, Israel believes that due regard should be given, first and foremost, to the serious lack of compliance. Non-compliance remains a serious alarming issue, especially in the Middle East.

Mr. Kulkarni (India): India voted against draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.35, on conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels, 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. As the world’s single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, the Conference 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 therefore no need 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. Furthermore, we believe that the security concerns of States extend beyond narrowly defined regions. Consequently, the notion of the preservation of a balance in 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. For that reason, India voted against the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.35.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation has in the past explained its position with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.24 on the strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region. We once again reiterate our position that the draft resolution is missing any reference to the source of danger to any region in which the Israeli regime is included. Having said that, I would like to emphasize that the scope and title of the draft resolution focus on the Mediterranean region and not the Middle East. Apparently, the representative of the Israeli regime has mixed up the regions. We once again emphasize the importance of referring to the danger of a regime equipped with weapons of mass destruction threatening the countries of the region.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting on the draft resolutions adopted under cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security”.

Before proceeding further, however, I wish to consult with delegations about how we will conduct today’s meeting. Given that this is our last meeting and that proposals remain under thematic cluster 7 and thematic cluster 1, as contained in informal paper A/C.1/77/INF/3/Rev.1, I respectfully propose that the Committee take up all the remaining proposals under cluster 7 and cluster 1 in a consolidated manner, with an opportunity to consolidate the general statements and explanations of vote prior to the actual voting and also to consolidate the explanations of vote after the voting. Thereafter, we will consider the draft provisional programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2023, as contained in document A/C.1/77/CRP.5.

Are there any comments on that proposal?

Mr. Fetz (Canada): We are happy to agree to the proposal, but only on the condition that we can make a general statement on cluster 1 and an explanation of vote under cluster 7. That is because, unfortunately, we have already agreed with our partners on the delivery of a joint statement on the draft resolution on the Conference on Disarmament, and we need to respond to the amendment that Iran has proposed to the draft resolution on a fissile material cut-off treaty. Of course, if Iran withdraws its amendment, we will not have to make a statement. But if that is not the case, then I beg your indulgence, Mr. Chair, to be able to make two statements.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): In terms of procedure, I would like to echo the remarks of our Canadian colleague. My delegation will also need ample time to explain its position before and after the voting. With regard to the substance, I would like to return the proposal to our Canadian colleagues: if they would revise the text, there would be no need for a vote on the amendment. So long as there is no flexibility from their side, there is merit to our amendment being considered by the Committee.

The Chair: There is a great deal of cooperation between the two sides. I am sure that they will work something out. That is very encouraging.

If I hear no objections, may I take it that the Committee decides to accept the proposal?

It was so decided.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”, and cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”, in a consolidated manner.

First, I shall give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions or decisions under cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”, and cluster 1 “Nuclear weapons”. But before doing so, I wish to inform representatives that the delegation of the United States has withdrawn its oral amendment to the amendment proposed by the Russian Federation. Subsequently, the delegation of the Russian Federation informed the Secretariat of its withdrawal of its amendment to the oral amendment of the United States.

Mr. Shevchenko (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation believes that the Conference on Disarmament is a crucial element of the disarmament triad and a unique specialized negotiating platform. We work assiduously to ensure a comprehensive and balanced programme of work, in accordance with the

negotiating mandate of the forum, based above all on the fundamental principles of its work, primarily the rule of consensus. The initiative spearheaded by Russia on the development of an international convention on countering acts of chemical and biological terrorism is aimed at helping the Conference on Disarmament (CD) emerge from the long-standing stalemate. The Chinese-Russian draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and the threat or use of force against outer space objects remains on the negotiating table at the Conference. Regrettably, in the past year, despite some positive developments at the CD, namely the initiation of discussions by its subsidiary bodies, the business-like and constructive atmosphere at this forum was almost completely ruined owing to the efforts of Western States. Against the backdrop of an already challenging situation at the CD, the unprecedented anti-Russian campaign waged by the United States and its allies has effectively paralysed the Conference. Unfortunately, that also affected the outcome of the meetings of the subsidiary bodies. Instead of substantive dialogue on agenda items, delegations were forced to listen to unbridled, baseless accusations by Western States against the Russian Federation. The Conference was therefore held hostage by that group of States, shamelessly using that unique disarmament platform for settling political scores.

We have already noted that the situation exists because Western colleagues are unwilling to implement the decisions taken at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, namely to develop international arms control and disarmament instruments. We must also note that our Western colleagues are persistently unwilling to listen to the views of other delegations. We believe that those actions are entirely politically motivated and rooted in the old principle, which is that those who are not for us are against us, and which is disastrous for multilateral diplomacy. We note that manipulation of various kinds occurred, ranging from flagrant violation of the rules of procedure to ignoring the fundamental rule of consensus of the Conference on Disarmament. In this context, the egregious case related to the organization — with the use of various unscrupulous manipulations — of a plenary meeting on Ukraine held on 3 March 2022, which was a flagrant violation of the guiding principles of the Conference’s work. We wish to note that the outcomes of the CD session were reflected in a purely technical document, which the delegations managed to agree on after lengthy and very difficult discussions.

However, even that hard-won consensus document is now being undermined by Western States at the stage of its consideration here in the First Committee owing to their actions with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25. We note that situation arose to no small degree due to the actions of the Ecuadorian presidency. The President submitted the document to the First Committee, knowing that it would not enjoy consensus and would be put to a vote. I must say that repeatedly warned our Ecuadorian colleagues about it during bilateral meetings. However, they did the bidding of those who pushed for the language in operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25 and deliberately included it, knowing very well it could not be approved without a vote. Consensus has therefore been undermined at the very stage of introduction of the draft resolution. We proposed several alternatives in order to agree on compromise language. However, all of them were ignored. Therefore, we proposed our first amendment with the sole goal of clarifying the understanding of operative paragraph 5 — that it refers only to discussions of the items on the Conference's agenda. We propose to insert in paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, after the word "discussions", the words "on the agenda items of the Conference on Disarmament", so that paragraph 5 would read "Takes note of other discussions on the agenda items of the Conference on Disarmament held in the course of the 2022 session".

Our amendment is intended solely to maintain the integrity of the work of the Conference on Disarmament within the agreed agenda, and we call for support in that regard to ensure consensus on the resolution and prevent next year's session from also being undermined.

Mr. Fetz (Canada) (*spoke in French*): Canada, in cooperation with Germany and the Netherlands, has the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices". Stopping the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons is an indispensable step towards a world free from nuclear weapons. To achieve that common objective, we need a new impetus towards commencing negotiations that are long overdue. That is the letter and spirit of our draft resolution. We thank the vast majority of delegations, who have consistently supported the previous iterations of the draft resolution, year after year, and we appeal to all delegations to vote in support of the draft resolution this year. This year's draft resolution recognizes the voluntary fissile

material moratoriums adopted by some nuclear-weapon States. Now more than ever, those moratoriums are an important confidence-building step. It is crucial that we recognize the growing norm against the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. It is the clear and consistent will of the vast majority of United Nations Member States to commence immediate negotiations, without further delay and without preconditions.

(*spoke in English*)

This year, Iran — one of the few States that regularly abstains in the voting on the draft resolution on this topic — circulated a hostile amendment to paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47. Iran waited until shortly before action was to be taken on the draft resolution, instead of proposing its amendment during the two informal consultations held by Canada. Iran's action is in bad faith and denies States the opportunity to comment on its amendment. The substance of Iran's hostile amendment is already addressed in the fourth preambular paragraph. An amendment to paragraph 1 would be duplicative and unnecessary. While Iran draws on language taken from the outcome document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, that does not mean that such language belongs in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47 — nor does it mean, in that context, that such language is agreed to by all United Nations Member States. That language has never been part of paragraph 1 in the previous iterations of the draft resolution, and we see no rationale for inserting it two decades after the 2000 Review Conference. Paragraph 1 currently focuses on the immediate commencement of treaty negotiations. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47 seek to keep paragraph 1 straightforward by minimizing the number of preconditions to negotiations and to encourage States to resolve outstanding issues at the negotiating table. It is unacceptable that Member States should wait any longer to commence negotiations. From our perspective, the amendment would not create any such conditions. However, that type of amendment could well be used as a stalling tactic by those seeking to impede progress on negotiations. In that regard, the amendment would be counterproductive and harmful to the intent of paragraph 1.

In conclusion, the amendment does not enjoy the consensus of all delegations and would not help the international community advance towards negotiations on a treaty. For those reasons, Canada urges Member

States to vote against the unnecessary and unhelpful amendment that Iran introduced without consultation and at the last minute. We urge delegations to support draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47 as submitted by its sponsors so that we can commence treaty negotiations without further delay.

Mr. Nyanid (Cameroon) (*spoke in French*): In its capacity as the current Chair of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa, Cameroon takes the floor to submit draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.28, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”, on which topic a draft resolution is submitted annually by the subregion.

In its preambular paragraphs, the draft resolution recalls the guidelines for general and complete disarmament adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session — its first session devoted to disarmament. Above all, the draft resolution recalls the Assembly’s previous resolutions on the issue, in particular resolution 76/60 of 6 December 2021, as well as the Standing Advisory Committee’s role in promoting arms control, disarmament, non-proliferation and development in the Central African subregion. It also affirms the importance and relevance of the Standing Advisory Committee and its various actions and initiatives as an instrument of preventive diplomacy in the establishment and consolidation of a normative and legal framework for peace in the subregion. Among other new elements, it takes note of the conclusions of the scientific symposium held in Yaoundé in May 2022 as part of the celebrations to mark the Standing Advisory Committee’s thirtieth anniversary on its substantial contribution in the service of preventive diplomacy in Central Africa. The draft resolution also welcomes the continued implementation of the institutional reform of the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), including the installation of the Committee of the Wise, as well as the holding of the republican dialogue held in Bangui from 21 to 27 March 2022, which brought together political and social forces with a view to continuing to work towards a peaceful solution to the crisis affecting that country.

The draft resolution also welcomes the signing by the Central African Republic and its neighbouring countries of a joint declaration on the dignified return of Central African refugees to their country, and takes note of the holding of an inclusive and sovereign

national dialogue for reconciliation in N’Djamena from 20 August to 8 October 2022 with the aim of laying new foundations for the peace and stability of Chad. The draft resolution also reiterates its concern about the humanitarian crisis caused by the displacement of populations in several Member States; the resurgence of intercommunal conflicts, in particular due to the scarcity of resources; the use of transhumance for criminal purposes, which has now been identified as an emerging insecurity phenomenon in Central Africa; and the rise in hate speech, particularly during electoral processes. Finally, the draft resolution recalls the conclusions of the fifty-second and fifty-third ministerial meetings of the Standing Advisory Committee, which were held, respectively, in Libreville from 22 to 26 November 2021 and in Yaoundé from 30 May to 4 June 2022.

In its operative paragraphs, the draft resolution reaffirms the General Assembly’s support for efforts to promote confidence-building measures at the regional and subregional levels in order to ease tensions and conflicts in Central Africa and to foster peace, stability and sustainable development in the subregion. It encourages the Committee, in view of the repositioning of ECCAS and the strengthening of the United Nations Office for Central Africa, to continue to serve within the United Nations as a high-level body for continuous monitoring, reflection and the fostering of solutions, with regard to the concerns and needs of the Central African subregion in the area of peace and security. It also requests the Secretary-General to convene the review conference of the Kinshasa Convention at a more convenient time, in accordance with article 34, paragraph 5, of the Convention. It encourages the development of mechanisms for regulation by ECCAS and calls for the holding of a high-level conference to discuss issues relating to pastoralism and cross-border transhumance with a view to ensuring joint and integrated management thereof.

Finally, the text decides to review the relevance and effectiveness of the work of the Standing Advisory Committee every three years in order to align its scope of competence with the constantly changing institutional environment and the numerous challenges facing Central Africa. In conclusion, my delegation indicates, as a reminder, that over the years, this draft resolution has always been adopted by consensus, and I hope for the same this year.

Mr. Montalvo Sosa (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I take the floor as the main sponsor of the draft resolution

A/C.1/77/L.25, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”, which among other key elements, in paragraph 9 requests:

“the Secretary-General to continue to ensure and to strengthen, if needed, the provision to the Conference on Disarmament of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services”.

Ecuador, in its capacity as President of the Conference on Disarmament, owing to its rotating system in alphabetical order, also assumed the responsibility for facilitating draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25. In that regard, I would like to reiterate that the text reflects the consensus of previous sessions and of developments that met with no objections in Geneva and, as noted in the fifth operative paragraph, “takes note of other discussions held in the course of the 2022 session”. It is not accurate to think that, without the slightest reference to the quoted text, consensus was guaranteed, as one delegation implied. Indeed, given the polarization of the discussions and the difficult convergence between what was requested by the different delegations, the draft resolution reflects, in the view of the facilitator, the best way to meet the request of the members of the First Committee. The text submitted is the product of extensive consultations initiated and developed in Geneva and continued without interruption at Headquarters in New York. In that process, Ecuador at all times sought in good faith to ensure an inclusive and transparent process, making every possible effort to facilitate a consensus. In its national capacity, Ecuador remains critical of the deadlock in the Conference on Disarmament and aware of its mandate. We therefore understand and share the frustration of many Member States and believe it is worthwhile to continue discussing all the persistent challenges. Finally, we continue to hope that delegations will adopt draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25 without a vote.

The Chair: 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 deliver this statement, which focuses mostly on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”, on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States, as well as on behalf of the following aligned countries: North Macedonia, Montenegro, Albania, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland and Norway.

The European Union and its member States remain concerned that the Conference on Disarmament (CD) continues to be deadlocked. We aim to reinvigorate

substantive work in the CD towards concrete negotiations. It is high time for the CD to become the disarmament negotiation forum that it once was. The European Union and its member States call on CD members to show political leadership in order to break the deadlock and to reflect on how that body can be strengthened, including through a review of its working methods and a joint understanding that the consensus principle does not equal a de facto veto. Our long-standing priority is to immediately commence negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices (FMCT), and we support starting such negotiations in accordance with document CD/1299 and the mandate contained therein. We call on all States to contribute to facilitating the long-overdue negotiations on an FMCT. Moreover, the EU and its member States support the enlargement of the CD, which currently comprises only 65 members. We call for the urgent appointment of a special coordinator to lead substantive consultations on the expansion of membership and lay out concrete scenarios for the consideration of CD members.

We commend the Secretary-General for the promotion of the implementation of the women and peace and security agenda, and support his efforts to promote gender equality and improve women’s full, active, equal and meaningful participation, including in leadership positions in disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control forums. In that regard, the EU is a supporter of actions 36 and 37 of the Secretary-General’s Agenda for Disarmament, aimed at full and equal participation of women in decision-making processes.

The EU and its member States deeply regret that the Conference on Disarmament was unable to reach agreement on a substantive report this year, owing to Russia’s blockage in an attempt to prevent broad condemnation of its war of aggression against Ukraine and acknowledgement of the security challenges caused by that war. The Russian Federation’s war of aggression against Ukraine is a gross violation of international law, including the Charter of the United Nations. It severely undermines European and global security and stability, and brings unbearable suffering to the people of Ukraine. By severely abusing the rule of consensus, Russia blocked any faithful reflection on the negative impact that Russia’s war of aggression had on the work of the world’s single multilateral disarmament negotiation body, despite that topic having been the subject of a large number of interventions. The obstructive approach of Russia has continued in the First Committee as

well, as all can see in its effort to deny that substantive discussions were actually held at the CD. Attempts to rewrite history on its own terms have a long tradition in Russia, but should not permeate our multilateral efforts.

As a consequence of Russia's blockage, the CD report does not provide a reflection on other important developments in the CD, including the establishment of subsidiary bodies and their deliberations on all issues on the CD agenda, the issue of unhindered participation of observers, or the failed attempts to correct the CD rules of procedure and make them gender-neutral. Such a situation is not tenable, given the significant security challenges we face today. Russia bears full responsibility for that failure. However, Russia's misuse of the rule of consensus cannot silence the international community in condemning Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine. That unjustifiable, unprovoked and illegal war is damaging the rules-based international order, the global economy and global food security in ways that harm all countries. It grossly violates international law and the Charter of the United Nations, undermines international security and stability, and is producing devastating effects on the world, throwing it into even more uncertain times. The impacts of Russia's aggression are global and affect people in all corners of the world, with particularly dramatic effects on those in the most vulnerable situations.

Mr. Soares Damico (Brazil): Brazil's approach to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", was anticipated in our statement on the cluster regarding the disarmament machinery (see A/C.1/77/PV.24). We there outlined its many failings and the need to urgently rethink its methods of work, composition and rules of procedure. Our position coincided, to a great extent, with the views expressed in the same meeting by the President of the Conference on Disarmament (CD), Ambassador Izquierdo Miño of Ecuador. We propose that this work be continued through the convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The Conference on Disarmament, the tip of the iceberg of that machinery, is perhaps the most obvious target for criticism. We share the frustration expressed with regard to the continued lack of results and the endless procedural wrangling.

Nevertheless, we should not fall prey to despondency, throw the baby out with the bathwater or succumb to the urge of being able to finally push a button on a matter

related to the CD. We therefore have a strong preference that the report of the Conference on Disarmament not be put to a vote.

The situation of the Conference on Disarmament is a symptom of a collective failure, as it does not exist in a void and is directly affected by the current state of affairs in the security realm. It is the result of decisions — some of them, we realize, might have been misguided — taken by members. Some even believe that we should try to redesign it. If we did, we would end up exactly where we stand now.

With that, I call on everyone to refrain from acting out of despair and to avoid taking actions that will have immediate repercussions on the operation of the CD in 2023 and in the near future. Do we seriously believe that the international community will be best served by suppressing the Conference on Disarmament without leaving another body in its stead? We should never forget that although the CD faces difficulties in delivering on its mandate as the single multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament, it is nevertheless a useful locus for dialogue on peace and security.

For those reasons, Brazil will vote in favour of the draft text endorsed by the penholder.

Mr. Hegazy (Egypt): My delegation wishes to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". Egypt appreciates the efforts of Ecuador, the current Chair of the Conference on Disarmament (CD), to reach consensus on the language of the draft resolution. As the incoming Chair of the CD, Egypt was hoping to adopt the draft resolution by consensus, as in previous years. Unfortunately, that will not be the case, taking into consideration current international tensions.

The language of operative paragraph 5 was introduced by Ecuador as an attempt to achieve consensus. Although the CD's annual resolution has always opted for language that clearly reflects the negotiating mandate of the body, as stipulated by the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD-I) (resolution S-10/2), in 1978.

However, in the last 48 hours, the First Committee received more than one proposal to amend operative paragraph 5. Egypt had to consider such proposals very carefully based on the negotiating mandate of the CD, as outlined by SSOD-I and our long-standing principle regarding the need to adopt a comprehensive and

balanced programme of work for the CD. Accordingly, Egypt intends to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole and the Russian Federation oral amendment, while abstaining in the voting on operative paragraph 5, as originally proposed by Ecuador.

Mr. Turner (United States of America): I just have a question at this point. I thought we were doing general statements, and we have now slipped into explanations of vote. I am prepared to give an explanation of vote, but I was waiting for that part of the discussion.

The Chair: I think that issue has been settled well and truly. I ask the representative of the United States to bear with us. The right of reply will be afforded to each member at the right time, and the explanation of vote is just about to follow.

The Committee will now listen to delegations wishing to explain their position before we take action on the draft proposals listed under cluster 7 and cluster 1.

Mr. Shevchenko (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We wish to additionally clarify our position on the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, on the report of the Conference on Disarmament (CD), taking into account the incorrect statements made by the representatives of a number of delegations.

We once again note that the outcome of the work that took place against a difficult backdrop in the Conference on Disarmament, which we already discussed in our previous statement, was reflected in a purely technical report after long and very difficult discussions, and it was then adopted by the Conference on Disarmament. In New York, a number of Western delegations attempted to review that report and include in it some language that was clearly not acceptable to a number of delegations, in particular operative paragraph 5, where it states “takes note of other discussions held in the course of the 2022 session”, which references the meeting of 3 March on Ukraine, which violated the rules of procedure of the CD.

We wish once again to stress that this meeting took place in violation of the rules of procedure of the CD. For our part, we did everything possible to maintain consensus on this document. We showed goodwill and proposed an amendment to operative paragraph five. Inter alia, we proposed to include a reference stating that these discussions were held under the agenda items of the CD. It would seem that this logical addition should have been opposed by none. However, that is not the case. As we heard today, Western States, understanding

that the meeting on 3 March was not consistent with the agenda of the CD, did not support our idea. They have thus de facto acknowledged that the meeting was held outside the mandate of the CD.

We will reject operative paragraph 5 in its current state.

Unfortunately, we also must once again note the non-cooperative and unconstructive manner in which this issue was handled by the Ecuadorian presidency. Essentially it will bear full responsibility for undermining the consensus nature of the document and for creating great difficulties in the further work of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain the position of my delegation regarding draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”.

In the spirit of transparency and in order to shed light on related developments and the reasons leading to the amendment introduced by my delegation to that document, I have the honour to share with all delegations the following background information.

First, over the past few years, the draft proposal for a treaty prohibiting the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices has in fact undergone a number of modifications, which, overall, have primarily diminished the draft proposal’s required content and orientation to the point that some of its key provisions have been lost in comparison to previously adopted documents.

Secondly, the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran participated in the informal consultations this year. When the last round of consultations, planned for 13 October, was cancelled, this delegation twice communicated with the focal point of the authors of the draft text, seeking the possibility of providing amendments. As a follow-up, the issue was raised in person with the same focal point. However, the answer received was as follows: we will not be making further edits to this one, so the version on the e-deleGATE portal is the final one. It should be underlined that the narrative of the delegation of Canada about the timing of the proposal is not correct.

Thirdly, in the light of those developments, while Iran had a couple of amendments, such as the need to address the two consecutive failures of the

Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) mentioned in the eleventh preambular paragraph and the need to retain the phrase “in the Conference on Disarmament” at the end of operative paragraph 2, it limited itself to the most important element of the draft proposal in operative paragraph 1.

Fourthly, accordingly, we suggested adding to the end of operative paragraph 1 the phrase: “taking into consideration both nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation objectives”. It goes without saying that we believe that that amendment should be added to the operative, rather than the preambular, section of the draft resolution.

Fifthly, such as amendment is indeed consensus-based language, obtained from the outcome document of the NPT Review Conference 2000, as reflected in document NPT/CONF.2000/28 (Parts I and II) page 14, in the section entitled “Article VI and eighth to twelfth preambular paragraphs”, paragraph 15, sub-paragraph 3.

Sixthly, it is language accepted by 191 Member States parties to the NPT, including the nuclear-weapon States, as well as the authors of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47. The argument that any amendment is to be, or should be, accepted by the entirety of the United Nations membership is not, and cannot be, supported by the realities.

We now have good reason to believe that, so as to honour their previously adopted commitments, both nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States, as well as Canada, as a State party to the NPT, would like to support our amendment. No excuse to withdraw or ignore the previously adopted commitments should be accepted.

We are adamant that any attempts to dismantle the draft resolution into a text lacking the essential components, as well as the appropriate directions, will damage the draft resolution. We therefore call on all Member States to support and vote in favour of the amendment, which is exceedingly advantageous to the draft resolution and, more crucially, to the global cause of achieving a world free of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Fetz (Canada): I take the floor today on behalf of New Zealand, Norway and my own country, Canada, to deliver an explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

We will vote against Russia’s amendment to operative paragraph 5 of that draft resolution, which was proposed at the last minute without consultation or adequate explanation.

We would have been ready to join consensus on this draft resolution. However, now that it is being voted on, we cannot but abstain. The report of the Conference on Disarmament (CD), as well as the draft resolution, have turned out to be disappointing, but they unfortunately reflect the reality that the CD once again failed to fulfil its mandate as a disarmament negotiating forum.

The 2022 report of the Conference on Disarmament (A/77/27) consists of five paragraphs and says little more than the following: we met this year, and we have decided to meet again next year. There is no mention of any negotiations or deliberations on disarmament. There is no reporting on exchanges of views on how the challenging international security environment impinges upon the fulfilment of the CD’s mandate, including Russia’s war of aggression against Ukraine and its related breach of security assurances and threats of the use of nuclear weapons, which have permeated almost all meetings since 24 February, nor is there any reporting on the fact that, once again, the CD failed to agree to update its rules of procedure to make them gender-neutral.

The reports of the CD have not been particularly substantive for many years, but this year the CD could not even agree on a procedural report. For example, this year’s report does not inform readers of how many formal and informal meetings were held because one delegation wanted to erase from the record the session of 3 March, during which many delegations stated their positions with regard to the situation in Ukraine — nor was there agreement on forwarding official documents to the General Assembly, again because of the opposition of one delegation. That lack of reporting, combined with the fact that many meetings of the CD are held in an informal format, renders this year’s activities of the CD particularly non-transparent.

The reality is that the CD has not fulfilled its negotiation mandate for decades. There is no doubt that a lack of political will is to blame, but the CD’s working methods have also contributed to the stalemate. Some States have interpreted the principle of consensus as the entitlement of any member to veto any procedural and substantive decisions, including whether a meeting can take place, or even continue. Consensus is not, and has never been, intended to create a de facto veto.

(spoke in French)

It is also not tenable to insist that treaty negotiations can be started and concluded only if everyone agrees, inasmuch as it would be untenable to insist that all who negotiate a treaty must then ratify it. The number of disarmament treaties negotiated outside the CD testify to that. The all-encompassing programme of work has also proved to be an insurmountable procedural hurdle, failing to garner consensus year after year following months of negotiation. The programme of work was never intended as such. It is simply a planning tool, not a prerequisite for negotiations. Negotiating mandates should be considered separately from the programme of work.

Finally, we are disappointed that the draft resolution on the CD's report is almost devoid of meaningful content. It fails to comment on the report of the work of the CD and offers no process or proposals to improve the work of the CD. In our desire to achieve consensus, we have allowed a small group of States to once again prevent the inclusion of language on the consequences of Russia's actions in Ukraine for the work of the CD, as well as a call for the full, equal and meaningful participation of women in the work of the CD.

It is time for the international community to reflect on how that body can be strengthened so that, taking into account the important resources allocated to it annually by the United Nations budget, it can again play its vital role as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum of the international community.

Mr. Siddique (Pakistan): I take the floor in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", as well as the amendment proposed to paragraph 1 of that draft resolution.

My delegation recognizes the effort made by Iran to improve the text of paragraph 1, and we acknowledge a degree of usefulness in that proposal. However, we continue to see fundamental problems with paragraph 1 and the draft resolution as a whole. In our view, the very approach, premise and basis of the draft resolution, as well as its proposed outcome, remain deeply flawed owing to its one-sided obsession with both a fissile material cut-off and its reference to document CD/1299, which has far outlived its utility, validity and relevance. The proposed amendment, while it takes a step in the right direction, does not address the fundamental issues

that I have just highlighted. However, we fully agree with the need to explicitly incorporate the disarmament component into any legal instrument on fissile material. Our voting position on the amendment and on paragraph 1 is without prejudice to our clear opposition to the concept of a cut-off and the relevance of document CD/1299. Pakistan has proposed a fissile material treaty as a new mandate, which expressly incorporates existing stocks in the scope of any future instrument at the Conference on Disarmament (CD). That proposal represents the only realistic way forward.

Pakistan will also vote against draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47 as a whole and against its third preambular paragraph for the following reasons. In our view, the draft resolution has from its inception remained deeply flawed in its approach, premise and proposed outcome. An arbitrary fixation on banning the future production of fissile materials, while refusing to address the thousands of tons of stocks thereof, advances neither nuclear disarmament nor strategic stability. A non-proliferation-oriented fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) remains self-serving and cost-free for most if not all of its ardent proponents. That is evident from their strident opposition to including stocks explicitly in the proposed treaty scope, as well as their continued expansion of their nuclear arsenals. The draft resolution also fails to take into account the impacts of the increase in conventional and non-conventional arms build-ups, as well as their integration and lethality, which affect the legitimate security interests of States, especially those faced with existing and growing asymmetries. Such an approach also goes against the fundamental principle endorsed in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2), namely, that all disarmament measures must ensure equal and undiminished security for all.

Forward movement on a fissile materials treaty will be possible with a clear, fresh and a priori mandate that explicitly includes past, present and future production of fissile materials in the treaty scope. The wide-ranging differences on the objectives and scope of the proposed treaty must be reconciled before considering the launch of negotiations in the CD. Neither the fallacious assertions in the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/77/C.1/L.47 nor the arbitrary portrayal of an FMCT as the key to unlocking the CD's deadlock can stand the test of any objective criteria. The propositions in the draft resolution are well-known tactics to deflect

scrutiny from non-compliance with nuclear disarmament obligations and a smokescreen to hide decades of ploys utilized to block negotiations on nuclear disarmament, the prevention of an arms race in outer space and the negative security assurances in the CD.

The fact that the very proponents of the draft resolution oppose a very weak reference to nuclear disarmament in the proposed amendment to paragraph 1 is further evidence of their reluctance to allow any meaningful progress on this topic. It is also another reminder of their single-minded pursuit of advantages for themselves while asking other States to forego their legitimate security concerns. The litmus test for those who argue that stocks can be discussed during the negotiations is to agree unconditionally on a fissile material treaty mandate that explicitly incorporates that provision and can yield a treaty that truly advances nuclear disarmament, in conformity with the principle of undiminished security for all, and not a discriminatory instrument designed to perpetuate strategic asymmetries and advantages for a few.

Mr. Turner (United States of America): I take the floor with respect to the oral amendment to paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

I would like to state at the outset our regret that this oral amendment process is happening at all. Ecuador, as the sponsor of the draft resolution, held multiple consultations and made heroic efforts on the text, first in Geneva and then here in New York. Delegations had every opportunity to negotiate the text at that time. The Russian delegation nevertheless chose to make a last-minute oral amendment that it knew would be problematic. When we offered an amendment to that amendment to make it more palatable to all countries, Russia made clear that it was prepared to do whatever it took to block any reference to other discussions. We withdrew our amendment to put an end to that one-upmanship, since the underlying issue remains the same.

The Russian Federation’s original amendment that remains under consideration is nothing but a continuation of its aggressive denial of the legitimacy of the formal plenary session of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) held on 3 March, during which multiple delegations addressed Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. It is also part of Russia’s unreasonable insistence that discussions on issues such as gender and disarmament or cybersecurity cannot be recognized unless explicitly listed in the CD

agenda. We absolutely reject Russia’s interpretation of those debates. The United States joined many others in identifying the many negative impacts of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine on each CD agenda item in formal and informal CD meetings.

We also believe that the inclusion of diverse perspectives in the work of the CD — reflecting, for example, on the effects of cybersecurity on disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament — and other such discussions are an inherent part of the work of the CD. It is our job to consider all factors that could affect the negotiation of disarmament and non-proliferation instruments. The United States categorically rejects the inference that any one Member State can dictate what is and what is not relevant to the work of the CD. It is important for the voices of all Member States to be acknowledged. We therefore call on all States to reject Russia’s amendment.

The Chair: As a reminder, I am seeing the list of speakers growing by the minute on the screen, and that does not augur too well if we are to conclude today. I would therefore kindly ask speakers to try to restrict their observations to their explanations of vote after the voting or to their right of reply. I hope that everyone will cooperate in that regard, because it would be in our interest to bring the proceedings to a close today.

Ms. Moyo (South Africa): I take the floor in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”.

South Africa wishes to acknowledge the efforts made by the main sponsors of the draft resolution to accelerate the commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty. However, my delegation expresses its disappointment that our inputs to the draft resolution were not considered or discussed. We believe that the consultations on the draft resolution could have been more inclusive and that another round of consultations would have proved to be beneficial. South Africa reiterates that nuclear disarmament is an international legal obligation and a moral and ethical imperative. We are deeply concerned about policies or pronouncements that move further away from the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, especially the trend of increases in nuclear-weapon stockpiles. Rather than strengthening international peace and security, that only weakens it by aggravating international tensions and conflict and jeopardizing the collective well-being of all States and peoples.

It must be reiterated that at the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the nuclear-weapon States unequivocally undertook to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament, to which all States parties are committed under article VI of that Treaty. Furthermore, actions 15, 16, 17 and 18 of the conclusions and recommendations for follow-up actions agreed by consensus at the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons need to be recalled. In that regard, nuclear-weapon States are called on to implement those actions and not selectively emphasize part of an action.

South Africa regrets that the CD has not reached consensus on a programme of work and has thus stalled the negotiations on a fissile material treaty and other substantive matters on the CD's agenda. We strongly believe that this treaty will improve the climate of trust between the nuclear-weapon States, supported by States with extended nuclear security guarantees, and all other non-nuclear-weapon States, and will help build confidence among those States that real steps towards nuclear disarmament are being taken. In the hope of resuming of negotiations on such an important treaty, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Zlenko (Ukraine): The delegation of Ukraine takes the floor in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". We will vote against Russia's proposed operative paragraph 5, and we will also abstain in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

In introducing operative paragraph 5 into the draft resolution, the Russian delegation is once again demonstrating the lack of respect and the capacity for abuse that it has shown throughout the work of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in 2022. The amendment is aimed at restricting the discussion of issues that are not properly reflected in the draft resolution, particularly an important discussion of Russia's aggression against Ukraine. The draft report of the CD is a huge disappointment for Ukraine because it does not reflect any substantive discussions within the CD during this year's session, especially on Russia's aggression against Ukraine. It also fails to reflect other important issues, such as those related to gender and cybersecurity. The same applies to the draft resolution, which does not reflect any of those important issues either. The current

language of operative paragraph 5 falls short because, as I said, it does not properly reflect the crucial issues. Russia's amendment is another attempt to limit and restrict the language of the draft resolution and the work of the Conference on Disarmament. We are therefore not in a position to support the draft resolution as a whole this year, and we call on Member States to vote against Russia's proposal.

Mr. Damico Soares (Brazil): We would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47. The question of negotiating a multilateral treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices has been a challenge to the best efforts of the international community since the mid-1990s. Clearly, a question whose answer has eluded generations of diplomats over the course of three decades is not one that can be easily sorted out. Our understanding of the issue is predicated on the fact that nuclear devices can be assembled either with existing fissile material or with materials that may be produced in the future.

According to the estimates available to us, there are approximately 1,460 metric tons of highly enriched uranium and 480 tons of plutonium unsafeguarded in the possession of nuclear-weapon States and other States with nuclear capabilities that are not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Approximately 25 kilogrammes of highly enriched uranium, or 8 kilogrammes of plutonium, are needed to equip one atomic device. A simple calculation would therefore indicate that enough material exists for 100,000 nuclear devices — nine times greater than the number of existing warheads. To make matters worse, we should not lose sight of the obvious fact that the material is not evenly distributed. It goes without saying that it has obvious political, military and strategic implications.

Furthermore, the issue of future production has to be addressed so that the problem does not get worse. For that reason, in its working paper CD/1888, Brazil proposed a framework treaty on fissile materials with two additional protocols, one dealing with stockpiles and the other with future production of fissile material. In our view, approaches that do not simultaneously attack the disarmament and non-proliferation aspects of the question are bound to encounter great difficulties. Irrespective of such considerations, Brazil will vote in favour of the draft resolution, as we believe this very serious issue should remain high on the disarmament agenda. We are also confident that the negotiation process

will enable delegations to move towards achieving a comprehensive agreement that addresses both stockpiles and future production.

Mr. Li Song (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I take the floor in explanation of our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25. As the first rotating Chair of this year's Conference on Disarmament (CD), together with its other members, at the beginning of the session I successfully pushed the CD to reach a consensus on its programme of work, including by establishing five subsidiary bodies to work on substantive issues. For reasons known to us all, the CD's work this year has been affected by the extreme events that have occurred in the area of international security. However, in accordance with the programme of work, which we agreed on at the beginning of the year, the five subsidiary bodies successfully made progress with their substantive work, in a clear demonstration that the members take the CD's work on various important agenda items seriously and that the machinery of the CD is practical and useful.

The annual report of the CD for this year and the consultation process for the draft resolution that we are currently discussing have gone through ups and downs and have seen stark political confrontations among Member States. Despite that, the Chinese delegation disagrees with certain Member States' statements expressing low regard for the usefulness of the CD. The CD's work is going through some serious difficulties that are not caused by the machinery of the CD itself and cannot simply be blamed on a lack of political will on the part of Member States. All the members of the CD who joined in its work have their own country-specific positions that are closely related to the overall security landscape, the countries' own security environment and their security relations with other Member States. I would like to emphasize that no other body is capable of replacing the CD as the only multilateral forum for disarmament negotiations. If its members can carry out their work on an equal footing and in a mutually respectful manner; if it can overcome the effects of politicization; if relevant substantial work, including negotiation, can be carried out while respecting the legitimate security concerns of all Member States and if the CD's work can be conducted in a more professional way, then the CD will indeed play its due role.

The Chinese delegation had hoped that the draft resolution on the CD's annual report would be adopted by consensus, as always. We lament the fact that this year it has to be put to a vote. Since we are forced to vote,

we will maintain our position. We will vote in favour of the amendment proposed by the Russian delegation and of the draft resolution as a whole.

Ms. Petit (France) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour to deliver this explanation of vote on behalf of France, the United States and the United Kingdom on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices".

As a nuclear-weapon State under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, our three countries are committed to a gradual approach to nuclear disarmament in a way that takes into account the prevailing security environment and is based on the principle of maintaining global strategic stability and undiminished and increased security for all. In that regard, we believe that the ultimate goal of a world without nuclear weapons cannot be achieved without ending the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

Our three countries reaffirm our support for and willingness to immediately begin negotiations on a non-discriminatory, multilateral and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, a fissile material cut-off treaty based on consensus and with the participation of all countries concerned. In that context, we continue to believe that the appropriate venue for negotiating that instrument is the Conference on Disarmament (CD). We strongly believe that negotiations based on document CD/1299 and the mandate it contains will enable the concerns of all CD member States to be addressed in a context that is acceptable to everyone.

With regard to the substance of the treaty, we continue to believe that a ban on the further production of fissile material for nuclear weapons constitutes an essential step in the area of disarmament. We highly value the work that has been achieved so far on a fissile material cut-off treaty. We welcome the consensus report adopted in 2015 by the Group of Governmental Experts to make recommendations on possible aspects that could contribute to but not negotiate a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices (see A/70/81), as well as the 2018 report of the High-level Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty Expert Preparatory Group (see A/73/159) and the technical discussions that took place in 2018 and 2022 in the relevant subsidiary bodies of the Conference on Disarmament.

Our three countries remain committed to voluntary moratoriums on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, which represent an important interim step. Pending the entry into force of a fissile material cut-off treaty, we call on States that possess nuclear weapons to declare and uphold a voluntary moratorium if they have not already done so. In that context, our three countries intend to support draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, and without diminishing that support, we deplore Iran's hostile draft amendment, which was proposed without any consultations.

Mr. Al Ashkar (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): I have asked for the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

Syria believes in the pivotal role of the Conference on Disarmament and its unique position within the United Nations disarmament mechanism. It is the international community's only multilateral forum dedicated to negotiating disarmament legal instruments. Maintaining the Conference's effectiveness and its vital role in achieving progress on the disarmament and non-proliferation regime requires a commitment to its mandate and negotiating role while keeping it free of political influences and tensions.

Some countries tend to use the draft resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament to score political points. That will not help to make the Conference more effective but will rather increase the problems it already faces and undermine its mandate and role. That reflects political selfishness and a lack of concern about the role and effectiveness of the Conference. Syria has suffered from politicization of the Conference in the past and from attempts to involve it in political issues and hold it hostage to agendas that are unrelated to the Conference's work, role or mandate. My delegation had hoped to send a message of support for the work and the mandate of the Conference on Disarmament. We had also hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus, as has traditionally been the case. However, in the current circumstances, we believe that it is not appropriate to use the draft resolution to address issues that go beyond the role, agenda and mandate of the Conference. Based on that, my delegation supports Russia's proposal for operative paragraph 5, because we believe that it keeps the draft resolution free of political tendencies and leaves it strictly committed to the mandate and agenda of the Conference on Disarmament.

The Chair: We will now begin voting on the draft resolutions. The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.6, 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.1/77/L.6 was submitted on 22 September 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.1/77/L.6.

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.1/77/L.6 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.9, 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.1/77/L.9 was submitted on 22 September 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.1/77/L.9.

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.1/77/L.9 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.21, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.21 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of South Africa. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/77/L.21.

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.1/77/L.21 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, 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.1/77/L.25 was submitted on 6 October by the representative of Ecuador. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/77/L.25.

The Chair: On 2 November the representative of the Russian Federation submitted a draft amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25. The amendment relates to operative paragraph 5 and reads as follows:

“In operative paragraph 5, add the words ‘on the agenda items of the Conference on Disarmament’ after the word ‘discussions’.

Operative paragraph 5 would therefore read as follows:

‘Take note of other discussions on the agenda items of the Conference on Disarmament held in the course of the 2022 session.’”

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Belarus, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Russian Federation, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, 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, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Gambia, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia

The draft amendment to operative paragraph 5 was rejected by 57 votes to 30, with 61 abstentions.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25. We shall now begin the voting process. I shall put operative paragraph 5 to the vote first.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines,

Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Belarus, Cuba, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Comoros, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Operative paragraph 5 was retained by 101 votes to 6, with 46 abstentions.

The Chair: We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan,

Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, 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, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, 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, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Austria, Canada, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Russian Federation, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, as a whole, was adopted by 157 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.28, 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.1/77/L.28 was submitted on 10 October by the representative of Cameroon 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.1/77/L.28.

The main sponsors of the draft resolution have informed us of the following oral revision to the text.

The thirty-sixth preambular paragraph would read as follows:

“Concerned by the persistence of the humanitarian crisis due to the displacement of populations in several Member States, the resurgence of inter-community conflicts due in particular to the scarcity of resources, the use of transhumance for criminal purposes, now identified as a phenomenon of emerging insecurity in Central Africa, as well as the rise of hate speech, especially during electoral processes.”

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.28, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.31, 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.1/77/L.31 was submitted on 8 October by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.31. The additional sponsors are listed on 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.1/77/L.31 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.37, 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.1/77/L.37 was submitted by the representative of Nepal on 10 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.37. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE

portal of the First Committee. Timor-Leste 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.1/77/L.37 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.44, 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.1/77/L.44 was submitted 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 on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.44. 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.1/77/L.44 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47 was submitted by the representatives of Canada, Germany and the Netherlands on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.47.

The Chair: On 25 October, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran submitted an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47. This amendment is contained in document A/C.1/77/L.77 and relates to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. In accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee will first take action on the amendment. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, China, Cuba, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Bhutan, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eswatini, Georgia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, New Zealand, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sudan, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia

The amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47 was rejected by 49 votes to 34, with 59 abstentions.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on the third and sixth preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47. I shall now put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one. I shall first put to the vote the third preambular paragraph.

*A recorded vote was taken.**In favour:*

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, 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, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Pakistan

Abstaining:

China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Russian Federation, Serbia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic

The third preambular paragraph was retained by 155 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

The Chair: We will now turn to the sixth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

China, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Nicaragua, Syrian Arab Republic

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 157 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.

The Chair: We now turn to operative paragraph 1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, 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, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

China, Pakistan, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Nicaragua, Syrian Arab Republic

Operative paragraph 1 was retained by 151 votes to 3, with 10 abstentions.

The Chair: We now turn to operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, 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, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania,

United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

China, Pakistan, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

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

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 157 votes to 3, with 8 abstentions.

The Chair: I now turn to operative paragraph three.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and

Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Algeria, China, Egypt, India, Jordan, Libya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Tunisia

Abstaining:

Bahrain, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen

Operative paragraph 3 was retained by 139 votes to 9, with 17 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, 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, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda,

Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

China, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan

Abstaining:

Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Israel, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, as a whole, was adopted by 169 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.

The Chair: 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.

Mrs. Romero López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", in keeping with our firm commitment to the only body with a negotiating mandate in the United Nations disarmament machinery.

In reviewing the work of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) during 2022, we are encouraged that at least a modest step forward was taken with the establishment of several subsidiary bodies. However, we regret that the unity achieved in the Conference by adopting such a decision could not be preserved in the submission to the First Committee of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, which does not enjoy the consensus of delegations. We reject the inclusion of a formulation in the text that attempts to legitimize discussions imposed on the Conference, ignoring its rules and practices, in particular rule 18, on consensus, which is the fundamental basis for the work of this body.

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25 should never have been contaminated with controversial elements that it was known beforehand did not have the consensus of all the members of the Conference. That is why Cuba

voted against operative paragraph 5 of A/C.1/77/L.25 and disassociates itself from that paragraph. We regret that the amendment proposed by the Russian Federation, which sought to limit this paragraph in a factual manner to the discussions on the issues mandated by the Conference, was not adopted.

The decision to force a vote in the First Committee to introduce non-consensual elements on the report of the CD into draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25 is unfortunate. It unnecessarily divides us and does not bode well for a good start to the work of the Conference in 2023. This decision has undermined the long-standing practice of consensus on the First Committee resolution on the annual report of the Conference on Disarmament. We hope that this scenario will not be repeated in future. We hope that next year we will return to the consensus principle that has always prevailed with respect to this draft resolution, which is vital for preserving universal support for the work of the Conference.

The Cuban delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”. Cuba considers it a priority for the Conference on Disarmament to fulfil its mandate as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. It is regrettable that since the adoption in 1996 of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty 26 years ago, the Conference has not been able to begin negotiations on any other disarmament instrument. We are convinced that the Conference has the capacity to negotiate simultaneously and without further delay legally binding instruments banning the arms race in outer space, establishing full security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States, including Cuba, and establishing a prohibition on fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, including both the production and stockpiles of such material.

The latter is very important. A fissile-material treaty that does not cover stockpiles would be totally inadequate; we would only have a selective non-proliferation instrument instead of the disarmament treaty we aspire to and need.

Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47 clearly omits the essential issue of stockpiles. That is why the Cuban delegation voted in favour of the amendment to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution proposed by the Islamic Republic of Iran (A/C.1/77/L.77). We regret that this important amendment was not adopted.

We also consider it inadequate and unbalanced that the text requires nuclear-weapon States to declare their production of fissile material, yet nothing is requested of them with regard to stocks of such material — despite the fact that such stocks are constantly being used today to develop and modernize nuclear arsenals. We hope that the major sponsors of the draft resolution duly take into account those considerations next year.

The Chair: As a reminder, we have 16 speakers and will probably need just about an hour. With everyone’s cooperation, we might arrive at the finish line in the nick of time. If representatives have long statements to deliver, I appeal to them to upload them to the portal.

Ms. Kristanti (Indonesia): On cluster 7, I would like to explain Indonesia’s position on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, on the report of the Conference on Disarmament (CD).

In the past few days, we have witnessed that consensus is increasingly becoming a luxury commodity in the First Committee. Politicization persists, and polarization is more apparent. While we commend Ecuador for its relentless efforts to garner consensus for the draft resolution, we deeply regret that today we had to vote on this draft resolution, which has previously been adopted by consensus. The adoption process also reveals a profound lack of trust, dialogue and political will, which unfortunately places enormous strain on our multilateral system.

Moreover, we regret that certain parties have attempted to dilute the mandate of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiations forum on disarmament. We should not let this draft resolution or any other work in the First Committee fall victim to such polarities, which may hamper the credibility and legitimacy of our work in the eyes of the global community.

My delegation once again reiterates that we need to extend our utmost solidarity and show our readiness to engage in dialogue in order to achieve a consensus solution. Regretfully, political will is absent. That is why our delegation voted to abstain in the voting on operative paragraph 5 and to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, as a whole, which manifests our commitment to ensure that the disarmament machinery functions and serves its purpose.

I would also like to take this opportunity to explain our voting position on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, in cluster 1. While we voted in favour of the draft resolution,

as a whole, and its paragraphs put to the vote, Indonesia would like to underscore several points.

Indonesia is committed to advancing negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear-explosive devices. That treaty should be balanced, non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable. Most important, that treaty should serve the objectives of both nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

Indonesia also shares deep concerns over the stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament carrying out its mandate to carry out negotiations on four core issues, including on fissile material production. In that regard, Indonesia joins the call for the CD to immediately commence negotiation on that issue on the basis of document CD/1299 and the mandate contained therein. However, Indonesia believes that CD/1299 should not be interpreted as confining the scope of the treaty to only future production of fissile materials. The document allows us to address all aspects of the treaty, including pre-existing stocks and the management of fissile materials. The treaty should enable the capture of as much fissile material as possible in order to significantly reduce existing weapons stockpiles.

We also believe that existing civilian and weapons excess stocks, as well as highly enriched uranium for naval or other military reactors, also need to be taken into consideration and addressed. They should be subject to applicable verification and safeguard mechanisms in order to ensure non-diversion to nuclear weapons or other nuclear-explosive devices. In that regard, we do not interpret the seventh preambular paragraph as an automatic exclusion from nuclear material safeguards for nuclear materials for military use. Otherwise, it would defeat the very objective and purpose of a comprehensive safeguards agreement.

In conclusion, Indonesia is of the view that any moratorium declared by nuclear-weapon States cannot serve as a substitute for the urgency of establishing a balanced, non-discriminatory, multilateral, internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear-explosive devices.

Mr. Kulkarni (India): On draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", India regrets that the consensus nature of this annual draft resolution has been adversely affected this year. As the world's single multilateral disarmament

negotiating forum, as mandated by the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2), the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) deals with the critical challenges of disarmament and international security facing the international community. India accords the highest priority to the Conference on Disarmament, which has the mandate, the membership and the rules for negotiating legally binding instruments on the core item on its agenda. India's vote has been guided by its belief that consensus is paramount in arms control and disarmament.

On draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", without prejudice to the priority India attaches to nuclear disarmament, India has expressed its readiness to support the immediate commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) in the CD on the basis of document CD/1299 and the mandate contained therein.

In that context, India has participated in the work of the Group of Governmental Experts on an FMCT and the FMCT High-level Expert Preparatory Group, established pursuant to resolutions 67/53 and 71/259. Our support for FMCT negotiations in the CD is consistent with India's interest in strengthening the global non-proliferation regime in a way that would add a measure of strategic predictability and a baseline for future global nuclear disarmament efforts. India therefore welcomed and voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, which shares the objective of an immediate commencement of negotiations on an FMCT in the CD on the basis of document CD/1299 and the mandate contained therein.

On paragraph 2, India does not object to Member States engaging in discussions in any forum to facilitate negotiations in the CD of an FMCT. However, India would like to reiterate its position that the only appropriate and formal forum for FMCT negotiations is the CD.

On paragraph 3 and a moratorium, India believes that a moratorium on the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons or nuclear-explosive devices cannot be a substitute for an FMCT. With due respect to all those who call for such a moratorium, we would like to remind them that such a moratorium, by its very nature, is voluntary, reversible and not verifiable, unlike an FMCT, which would impose a treaty obligation and be verifiable and irreversible. A moratorium will only weaken the

resolve to negotiate an FMCT and set us back. India therefore does not support the call for a moratorium.

Finally, as to the references to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, India is not a State party to the Treaty. This particular reference is therefore not applicable to India and may be kept in perspective by Member States

Mr. Roethlin (Austria): I take the floor to deliver an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

The continued stalemate of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) for more than two decades is a matter of grave concern for Austria. Many efforts have been made in recent years to bring the CD closer to its mandate — to negotiate multilateral disarmament agreements. As outlined in our thematic statement on cluster 7, we are extremely concerned about tendencies that challenge the disarmament regime and the use of procedural manoeuvres to delay, undermine or even prevent substantive exchanges and productive work.

When it comes to the CD, Austria has a clear track record of supporting all proposals and ideas, facilitating consensus and improving the working methods of the CD. Austria also has a track record as a strong supporter of an inclusive CD, open to membership by all interested States, with the full, effective and meaningful participation of women, as well as the active participation of civil society. However, the lack of political will has been preventing progress on any issue for more than two decades.

The 2022 report of the CD (A/77/27) lacks any substance, including on the exchanges that took place on the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine, the deteriorating international security situation and the importance of finally fulfilling the mandate of the CD in that regard. That further damages the credibility and relevance of the CD, as did the discussions on the draft resolution before this Committee.

While we regret that a consensual adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25 was not possible this year, for the reasons just outlined Austria had to abstain in the voting on it.

We urge the United Nations membership to reflect on what can be done to reinvigorate the Conference on Disarmament as a negotiation body in order to fulfil its mandate. Unlike the CD, the world has not stood still for more than 20 years. If we want the CD to remain relevant,

it cannot be held hostage by consensus interpreted as a veto. Rather, it needs to immediately commence actual work. That actual work is concrete negotiations. We urge all States to demonstrate political will.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): I take the floor to explain my delegation’s vote after the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”.

My delegation is grateful for the support of each and every delegation that voted in favour of our draft amendment and consistently supported the lofty goal of a world free of nuclear weapons.

We had to vote against this draft resolution as a whole. In fact, due to the lack of will among the co-sponsors of the draft resolution to consider new proposals, we limited ourselves to offering only one important amendment, trying to strike a balance and, indeed, reflect the position of a large majority of Member States on operative paragraph 1. The changes to that paragraph made by the main sponsors disrupted the minimum balance. We therefore tried to restore the balance, taking into account the non-proliferation and disarmament objectives shared by many delegations.

From our perspective, document A/C.1/77/L.47 does not advocate an instrument capable of addressing all the conditions required for a complete disarmament instrument and, instead, advocates the commencement of negotiations on such a treaty, based on a limited mandate, contained in an old document that is no longer relevant to today’s realities.

On draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”, my delegation deeply regrets the fact that, after years of being adopted by consensus, the draft resolution is now being voted on owing to a non-consistent approach.

The Islamic Republic of Iran actively and constructively engaged in the consultations held in Geneva and in the two rounds of consultations held in New York, in addition to the bilateral consultations with the penholder of the draft resolution.

We firmly believed that the text of the draft resolution should be free of any contentious or non-consensual language and, despite the close consensus reached by the delegations and the significance of including Cuba’s factual proposals, we recommended to the penholder

that a consistent approach be used with regard to the text put forward by the delegations.

Unfortunately, that proposal was not reflected and, owing to the non-acceptance of some of the other proposals, we were even ready to put aside all the proposals and not include any controversial language in the draft resolution. But, surprisingly, such a consistent and fair approach was not taken, and operative paragraph 5 was nevertheless included in the final document despite our clear objection to it and that of other delegations. The draft resolution could have been revised so that the said paragraph was deleted. However, that was not the case again.

In our view, that paragraph not only has no added value for the resolution, but also sets the stage for further contentious deliberations during the Disarmament Conference's subsequent meetings. Iran holds the view that the discussions that took place outside the CD's agenda are unrelated to the CD's work because they were held contrary to the rules of procedure. Iran clearly expressed its opposition to that in Geneva.

Based on that, and given the non-acceptance of the amendment to operative paragraph 5, we had to abstain in the voting on that operative paragraph.

Mr. Hegazy (Egypt): My delegation wishes to explain its vote after the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices". While we share the goals of the draft resolution, Egypt abstained in the voting on operative paragraphs 1 and 2 and the resolution as a whole and voted against operative paragraph 3 for the following reasons.

First, the lack of a clear reference to the fact that any negotiations on banning fissile material for weaponization purposes in the foreseen future will include existing stockpiles, thereby turning the instrument into another non-proliferation measure that does not contribute to nuclear disarmament, adding to the discrimination and huge imbalances between the obligations of nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States. My delegation's vote on this draft resolution today serves to reiterate that Egypt will not accept a discriminatory fissile material treaty that does not include existing stockpiles.

Secondly, operative paragraph 1 lacks a reference regarding the commencement of the negotiations within the Conference on Disarmament (CD) based on an agreed comprehensive and balanced programme of work.

Thirdly, operative paragraph 2 lacks a reference to conducting such negotiations within the CD.

Fourthly, operative paragraph 3 uses the term "States that possess nuclear weapons". That term represents a clear violation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as the Treaty recognizes only five nuclear-weapon States, taking into account the fact that the main sponsors of the draft resolution oppose any reference to nuclear sharing or nuclear military alliances.

The same principle applies to the term "States that possess nuclear weapons". That term recognizes some non-States parties to the NPT as nuclear-weapon States. Egypt will not recognize any nuclear-weapon State apart from the five nuclear-weapon States recognized by the NPT under any circumstances.

We urge the main sponsors of the draft resolution to use the correct term, which is "nuclear-weapon States", and to refrain from using the term "States that possess nuclear weapons", which is against the spirit and goals of the draft resolution.

Ms. Nam (New Zealand): I take the floor to explain New Zealand's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices".

New Zealand is a long-standing supporter of the negotiation of a treaty on fissile material and has consistently supported efforts within the Conference on Disarmament, this body and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to make progress in that regard. We believe that such a treaty should be comprehensive and should address both stocks and production — something that we view as being consistent with the Shannon Mandate. The Mandate was crafted to be flexible and responsive to the varying priorities that States clearly have regarding the treaty. We therefore support the original text, as put forward by the main sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47.

Despite the efforts over the course of several years, we are unfortunately still no closer to starting treaty negotiations owing to calls for conditionality prior to negotiations commencing. In New Zealand's view, any outstanding issues can and should be resolved during the course of negotiations. They do not need to be resolved before negotiations commence.

In that regard, we do not consider it helpful to introduce at this late stage wording that is likely to be interpreted as placing further conditionality on treaty

negotiations. Certainly, such language, as has been proposed in the amendment to operative paragraph 1, would not be conducive to moving the international community forward.

New Zealand therefore voted in support of the draft resolution overall, but has abstained in the voting on the proposed amendment to operative paragraph 1. We remain committed to the pursuit of a fissile material treaty that contributes to both nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and urge all States to focus on how we can achieve that with the urgency now required.

Mr. Sánchez Kiesslich (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I wish to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

At the outset, I want to thank the delegation of Ecuador for all its efforts to seek language on a text that would be acceptable for the whole membership. We are convinced that this was the case. The lack of agreement is nothing more than a reflection of the situation that the Conference on Disarmament (CD) is currently in. The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2) identified the Disarmament Commission as the deliberative forum of a universal nature and the Conference on Disarmament as the only multilateral organ for disarmament negotiations, with limited membership precisely so that it can carry out its negotiating mandate.

However, despite its prior achievements, since 1996, when it was unable to adopt the text that would later become the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, thanks to the General Assembly, the CD has ceased all substantive activity. There have not been negotiations on any topic. Every year, the Conference on Disarmament only deliberates, wasting the human and financial resources of the Organization without fulfilling its mandate, which is to negotiate, and failing to balance the institutional machinery of disarmament. It duplicates and has even taken on functions of the Disarmament Commission.

Some delegations wish to maintain the status quo, entrench the paralysis and rely on the rules of procedure, which favour the imposition of their position or that of a minority or even just a single delegation. Consensus has become a veto for each one of its 68 members. At the time, Mexico did not object to the establishment of working groups or subsidiary organs, but that kind of mechanism has not generated any results, as we can see

in the annual report of the conference (CD/2310), which says nothing at all.

In summary, the Conference on Disarmament serves only the interests of nuclear-weapons States in order to perpetuate the fiction that there are negotiations under way on disarmament. In the absence of a programme of work worthy of the name, the Conference on Disarmament has also been used for positioning issues unrelated to its mandate and agenda, such as regional matters. That serves only to polarize members and promote excessive politicization, causing the forum to lose relevance.

That situation was once again laid bare during this session. But we need to be clear that this is an issue that has accumulated over many years and is in no way exclusive to this session. Mexico believes that such a paralysis or stalemate are unacceptable as normal or appropriate. It is therefore necessary to convene a fourth session on disarmament in order to undertake urgent changes to our institutional architecture.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, I wish to explain that Mexico abstained in the voting on the amendment to paragraph 1. We are in favour of the substance but not with the process by which the amendment was presented. On paragraph 3, Mexico abstained in the voting since we do not agree with the so-called new category.

Mr. Louafi (Algeria) (*spoke in Arabic*): My country’s delegation has asked for the floor to explain its vote after the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, entitled “Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”.

Pursuant to the report of Ambassador Gerald Shannon contained in document CD/1299, Algeria supports the mandate of beginning negotiations in the context of a comprehensive programme within the Conference on disarmament for establishing a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear-explosive devices. That will be in line with the negotiations for eventually realizing nuclear disarmament. Those negotiations remain our first priority.

The Treaty that we hope for must achieve two goals, namely, disarmament and non-proliferation and must be one of the elements of a process that leads to complete nuclear disarmament. It should not focus on the prohibition of future production only, but must

also deal with existing stocks as noted in Ambassador Shannon's report.

In its various paragraphs, draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47 attempts to address to a certain extent the concerns raised by the majority of States by adhering to the language of previous relevant resolutions. However, my country's delegation was surprised this year by some strange language added to operative paragraph 3, which will lead to further concerns about the text of the draft resolution, and will also undermine the efforts of the States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as well as the efforts of States parties to the United Nations disarmament machinery, including the Conference on Disarmament, by adding new categories of States, which could jeopardize what has already been adopted by consensus for decades.

Mrs. Balázs (Hungary), Vice-Chair, took the Chair.

Algeria does not usually vote against any paragraph or draft resolution in the First Committee. However, due to the concerns raised by the language in the new operative paragraph 3 and the trend that could be taken by the draft resolution in the future, my country's delegation voted this year only against operative paragraph 3, but in favour of the draft resolution, as a whole.

In conclusion, we hope that the penholders of the draft resolution will consider in the future the concerns raised by the new language and return to the normal language of previous resolutions.

Ms. Lee Hyun Goo (Republic of Korea): My delegation takes the floor on behalf of the Republic of Korea and Australia in order to explain our position after the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

We appreciate the enormous efforts of Ecuador, as Chair of the Conference on Disarmament, to facilitate a consensus draft resolution. Traditionally, this draft resolution has been adopted by consensus. As such, it is deeply regrettable that that is not the case this year.

We would like to take this opportunity to underline the importance of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiation forum. It is also our strong belief that the mandate and authority of the CD should not be challenged under any circumstance, even at times where the effective functioning of the body is seriously impeded by the aggravated security situation, namely, the Russian Federation's unjustifiable and unprovoked war on Ukraine. Against that unprecedented

security backdrop, it is even more important to bear in mind the collective responsibility to revitalize the CD and make its substantive discussions live up to our standards.

For the reasons that I just mentioned, we voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. Nevertheless, we find it extremely regrettable that an unexpected oral amendment was submitted regarding operative paragraph 5 just the day before the Committee takes action on this draft resolution. Taking into account the fact that, after a number of informal meetings, States have displayed maximum flexibility in their goodwill for the sake of maintaining the consensus, the last-minute amendments by the Russian Federation cannot be interpreted in any way other than as an attempt to disregard the important, timely and relevant discussions, in which all members of the CD engaged extensively and thoroughly on issues, including gender, cybersecurity and the war in the Ukraine. We therefore voted against the Russian amendment.

In conclusion, we hope to continue to engage constructively in the substantive work of the CD in order to make progress in revitalizing the forum.

Mr. Hauri (Switzerland): I take the floor to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.25, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

Our delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution on the Conference on Disarmament (CD) this year, as we continue to see the potential for that body to once again play a key role in the negotiation of disarmament and arms control agreements. Nevertheless, we feel compelled to put a number of considerations and concerns on record, as the draft resolution does not seem to faithfully reflect the challenges faced by the CD and a number of worrisome developments. That is underscored by the fact that the draft resolution on the CD was not adopted without a vote for the first time since the establishment of the CD in 1979.

The CD has been unable to conduct negotiations and fulfil its mandate for more than 25 years. The reports of the CD during that period have taken a procedural, rather than a substantive, form. That regrettable situation has not improved this year; quite the contrary, the difficulties seem to have further increased, notably because of the deteriorating international security environment. That is illustrated by the fact that the report (A/77/27) submitted by the CD to the General Assembly this year is void of any substance, is uniquely of a technical nature and contains only five paragraphs.

Other elements underline the paralysis affecting the CD. While the CD regularly considered and updated its method of work in the past, with a view to improving efficiency and effectiveness, today the Conference on Disarmament seems no longer able to take such steps. Even simple technical amendments to the rules of procedure, for instance, to reflect the equality between women and men in participating in the work of the CD, no longer seem possible. Similarly, the question of the enlargement of the CD remains unaddressed.

In that context, we are of the view that the draft resolution should better reflect developments, or the lack thereof, within the CD and the challenges that the CD is facing so that the General Assembly can take fully informed decisions when considering the work of the body.

Finally, going forward, we would like to underline the importance for the General Assembly to reflect on how the CD can be strengthened. Urgent efforts are needed in view of the Conference's central role in the disarmament machinery as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum of the international community and in order to ensure that it once again fulfils its important mandate,

Mr. Shevchenko (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): In clarifying our position on the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", we wish to note that it is based on the lack of an important provision in the text with regard to the fact that the negotiations on the treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear-explosive devices (FMCT) must be carried out on the basis of a balanced programme of work in the Conference on Disarmament.

The draft resolution proposed weakens the fact that the Conference is the only platform for such discussions. Our view is that attempts to bring such a discussion beyond the scope of the Conference on Disarmament can only undermine the work on the treaty. In its current form, the draft resolution not only undermines the efforts to establish the treaty, but will in fact prevent the treaty from being established in its entirety. That is why we abstained in the voting on this draft resolution, since our principled position is focused on the FMCT negotiations.

We also note that we wish to use our right of reply owing to the baseless statements that were made against the Russian Federation by a number of delegations.

Mr. Li Song (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I would like to take the floor to explain China's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47.

China has always supported starting the negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear-explosive devices (FMCT) within the Conference on Disarmament (CD), in line with the Shannon Mandate, based on a comprehensive and balanced programme of work. However, Western countries that sponsored the draft resolution this year, in disregard of the long-standing international consensus and the important and reasonable inputs of some Member States, including China, made a series of disruptive amendments to operative paragraphs of the draft resolution.

First, in operative paragraph 1, the reference to the comprehensive and balanced programme of work as the basis for commencing the FMCT negotiations within the CD, a long-standing consensus, has been deleted.

Secondly, in operative paragraph 2, the CD, as the explicitly agreed forum for negotiations on the FMCT, has been removed in an attempt to indicate that a new process for the negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty can be created in forums other than the CD.

Thirdly, the sponsors insisted on inserting in operative paragraph 3 language on a moratorium on production. I would like to stress that the CD is the only appropriate forum for negotiating and concluding the FMCT. If the negotiations on an important treaty such as the FMCT do not involve China and all the other stakeholders on the basis of general and equal participation, China will have nothing to do with such a treaty.

On the issue of stopping the production of fissile material for use in nuclear weapons, China has never recognized the practical value of the so-called moratorium on production. In particular, a series of developments in recent years have further shown that the policies of some States that declared a moratorium are hypocritical and not credible. Some such States acquired a large stockpile of weapons-grade fissile materials as early as during the Cold War era. As such, their declarations are of no practical value whatsoever.

A country suddenly announced an increase in its nuclear-warheads ceiling. That country and its nuclear-weapon State allies have arrangements in place for mutually transferring weapons-grade fissile materials, which leads to questions over the meaningfulness of its declared moratorium.

Worse still, two countries that declared a moratorium decided to engage in nuclear submarine cooperation with a non-nuclear-weapon State, which involves the transfer of tons of weapons-grade fissile materials.

Given what I just said, one cannot help but ask what are the practical value and significance of the moratorium commitments made by such countries. As a result, China has repeatedly enunciated that negotiating and concluding the FMCT at the CD, thereby addressing the cut-off issue in a legally binding manner, is an effective solution.

I would like to stress once again that the current draft resolution on the FMCT would by no means facilitate the commencement of the FMCT negotiations and would only lead the negotiation process to a dead end. That is an extremely irresponsible approach to the reasonable and effective multilateral process on arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation. Such a practice will also have a significantly negative impact on the authority, status and role of the CD, with nothing to gain and everything to lose from such a practice.

Given that it is a draft resolution that seeks to impose the above-mentioned conspiracy and demands on others, China had no choice but to vote against draft resolution

A/C.1/77/L.47. We also demonstrated our position and attitude in the voting on the paragraphs concerned.

Mr. Kalmar (Israel): I wish to provide an explanation of vote with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47, entitled "Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices".

The relevance of a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) to address the current proliferation challenges, including non-compliance by States with their international obligations in the nuclear domain, is questionable.

It has been Israel's long-standing position that the FMCT could be part of a possible new consensual regional security architecture with a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. Unfortunately, the essential prerequisites for that are far from being fulfilled.

The Chair: We have exhausted the time available to us. However, we will meet this afternoon in the General Assembly Hall at 3 p.m. to exhaust the list of speakers and conclude the 2022 session of the First Committee.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.