



# General Assembly

Seventy-seventh session

## First Committee

**25<sup>th</sup>** meeting

Friday, 28 October 2022, 3 p.m.  
New York

Official Records

*Chair:* Mr. Pieris .....(Sri Lanka)

*The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.*

### Agenda items 90 to 108

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

**The Chair:** The Committee will now begin the third and final phase of its work, namely, “Action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under agenda items 90 to 108”.

The Committee will be guided in that regard by the informal papers that are issued by the Secretariat containing the draft resolutions and decisions on which action will be taken each day. Informal paper 1/Rev.2 has been circulated and is available in the conference room. We will take action on the drafts under each cluster listed therein. The Secretariat will revise that informal paper on a daily basis in order to update the drafts that are ready for action at each of our remaining meetings.

Before we proceed, I propose that we follow the same procedures adopted by the Committee at previous sessions concerning the conduct of business during this action phase. That is to say, we will have the following established four-step process: first, general statements under each cluster; secondly, explanations of vote before action; thirdly, action on the drafts; and, fourthly, explanations of vote after action.

Under each cluster listed for any given day, the Committee will first hear general statements. That is the opportunity to introduce draft resolutions and decisions ready for action on that day or at subsequent

meetings. I would request that the general statements kindly be made as brief as possible and no more than five minutes.

Next, delegations wishing to explain their positions on any of the drafts under a cluster will have the opportunity to do so in a single intervention before the Committee proceeds to take action on those drafts, one after another and without any interruption in between.

I would like to remind delegations that, in accordance with the modalities decided at the organizational meeting of 29 September, explanations of vote are limited to five minutes, with the option of longer statements being reflected on the e-statements portal.

Pursuant to rule 128 of the rules of procedure,

“After the Chair has announced the beginning of voting, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting”.

In the case of a voting error, delegations wishing to register their original voting intention should not disrupt the voting process to request a correction by taking the floor. They should instead submit their voting intention online via e-deleGATE or approach the Secretariat on the process for submitting the original voting intention for reflection in the official records.

Once the Committee has completed action on all draft proposals under a particular cluster listed in the day’s informal paper, delegations preferring to explain their positions or votes after action is taken will also have the opportunity to do so. Similar to the

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>).

22-65984(E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



consolidated explanations of vote before the voting, delegations are requested to make their explanations in one intervention.

Also, in accordance with rule 128 of the rules of procedure, sponsors of draft resolutions and decisions are not permitted to make any statements in explanation of their vote either before or after action is taken.

Delegations seeking recorded votes on any draft resolution or decision are requested to kindly inform the Secretariat of their intention as early as possible and before the day's meeting begins.

All delegations wishing to postpone action on any draft they submitted are also requested to inform the Secretariat at least one day before action is scheduled to be taken on the draft in question. Nonetheless, I appeal to all delegations to make every effort to refrain from delaying action.

In order to ascertain that every delegation fully understands the process for the action phase, the Secretariat has prepared an information sheet, similar to the one that was circulated in previous years, regarding the ground rules for taking action on draft resolutions and decisions.

With the full cooperation of members, I intend to follow the procedure I have just explained in order to ensure the full and efficient utilization of the remaining time for this final stage of our work.

May I take it that the Committee wishes to proceed accordingly?

*It was so decided.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions and decisions listed under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons", as contained in informal paper 1/Rev.2. Once we have completed action on cluster 1, we will proceed to take action on the drafts listed under cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction". In accordance with past practice, if action on the drafts listed in the informal paper for a particular meeting is not completed, the Committee will first finish action on the remaining drafts in that informal paper before starting action on the next cluster.

Let me take this opportunity to inform members that the main sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.47 have requested a deferment of action, and the main sponsor of draft decision A/C.1/77/L.75 has informed the Committee of the withdrawal of that proposal.

Therefore, neither proposal is reflected in the informal paper for action today.

Before proceeding further, let me remind delegations that given the substantial number of votes requested under this cluster, we need to dedicate at least one and a half hours to the actual voting. This means that in order for the Committee to complete the voting at 6 p.m., it has to start taking action on the proposals under cluster 1 before 4:30 p.m. today in order to respect rule 128 of the rules of procedure on the non-interruption of the voting process.

I now open the floor for delegations wishing to make either a general statement or to introduce new or revised drafts under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons".

Let me remind all delegations once again that the sponsors of draft resolutions and decisions may make general statements at the beginning of the consideration of drafts under a cluster but may not make statements in explanation of their vote on their proposals before or after action is taken. Statements are limited to five minutes.

**Mr. Turner** (United States of America): The United States co-sponsored Japan's annual draft resolution on nuclear disarmament, A/C.1/77/L.61, entitled "Steps to building a common roadmap towards a world without nuclear weapons", as we have done for the last two years. This draft resolution is designed to build bridges between nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States, and Japan, in this year's draft resolution, capitalized on the consensus agreed at the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), held in August, before Russia, and Russia alone, blocked the final document.

The draft resolution demonstrates our commitment to achieving our article VI NPT obligations to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and to nuclear disarmament at an early date. We urge all other delegations to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.61.

**Mr. Ogasawara** (Japan): Every year since 1994, Japan has submitted a draft resolution on the elimination of nuclear weapons, laying out a pragmatic path towards the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons. Every year that draft resolution has been adopted by the General Assembly.

At the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), in August, while the draft final document was not adopted by consensus, States parties reconfirmed the strong belief that maintaining and strengthening the NPT as the cornerstone of the global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime is in the interest of the international community as a whole. In addition, we consider that the draft final document set forth a new basis for the international community to advance realistic and practical discussions towards nuclear disarmament.

The threat of nuclear weapons being used today is higher than at any time since the height of the cold war. Despite those circumstances, we face both a serious divergence in approaches to nuclear disarmament and a lack of mutual confidence in international security, making it extremely difficult to cooperate in advancing our steps towards a world without nuclear weapons.

Against that backdrop, at the NPT Review Conference in August, Prime Minister Kishida of Japan announced the Hiroshima Action Plan, which is rooted in five actions. That is offered as the first step of a realistic road map to span the gap between the ideal, which is a world without nuclear weapons, and the reality of a severe security environment. Japan considers it necessary to indicate a road map towards realizing a world without nuclear weapons and reinvigorate the momentum for that, despite, or rather because, of those very difficult circumstances.

Based on that idea, our draft resolution this year, entitled “Steps to building a common roadmap towards a world without nuclear weapons”, proposes realistic and pragmatic actions, reflecting valuable language and ideas of the draft final document of the tenth NPT Review Conference.

As the only country to have suffered atomic bombings during a war, Japan will continue to make every effort towards the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons. Japan hopes that this draft resolution will gain support from Member States.

**Mr. Tun** (Myanmar): I wish to congratulate you, Mr. Chair, and all members of the Bureau on your hard work and great efforts to bring a successful outcome to the work of the First Committee.

I have the honour to formally introduce draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.42, entitled “Nuclear

disarmament”, under agenda item 99(b) of cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”. Myanmar has submitted the draft resolution in the First Committee consecutively since 1995. Every year it has been adopted with the overwhelming majority support of Member States.

The draft resolution urges all nuclear-weapon States to take effective disarmament measures to eliminate all nuclear weapons at the earliest possible time and to take concrete practical steps towards establishing a world free of nuclear weapons.

The draft resolution underlines the importance of convening, as a priority, a United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament to review the progress made. We recognize the efforts of Member States to achieve our goal of a world free of nuclear weapons. However, it was regrettable that the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, held last August, did not reach agreement on the substantive final document.

The draft resolution reiterates its call for an early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, expressing deep concern about the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons. We also welcome and express our sincere appreciation to the six Member States that ratified it in 2022.

The draft urges the Conference on Disarmament to commence, as early as possible, its substantive work during its 2023 session, taking into consideration all existing priorities in the field of disarmament and arms control, including the immediate commencement of negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear weapons convention. The draft resolution does not feature a substantive amendment; it is only a revamped draft with technical updates to last year’s.

Nuclear weapons are immensely threatening to international peace and security today. Nuclear threats are the most serious security challenge, threatening the existence of humankind and dwarfing all other threats, including environmental disasters, humanitarian disasters, economic crises and health problems. We all agree that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. Therefore, the only way to safeguard us from the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is their total elimination. Let us work together to achieve our goal of a world free of nuclear weapons.

For those reasons, we kindly request that all Member States support draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.42 by co-sponsoring and voting in favour of the draft resolution.

We take this opportunity to extend our sincere thanks to all members for their continued unwavering support for this draft resolution during past sessions as well as at this session.

**Mr. Vorshilov** (Mongolia): I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution entitled “Mongolia’s international security and nuclear-weapon-free status” (A/C.1/77/L.19) to the Committee for its consideration.

To date, the following delegations have joined Mongolia as co-sponsors: Algeria, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Egypt, France, Germany, Guatemala, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Spain, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam. My delegation wishes to express sincere gratitude to the co-sponsors of the draft resolution for their valuable consideration.

Furthermore, my delegation wishes to express its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his report on this subject, contained in document A/77/184. The draft resolution is based on the previous resolutions on the item, adopted without a vote, and contains only technical updates.

This year marks the thirtieth anniversary of Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free status. Since 1998, the General Assembly has been supporting and welcoming Mongolia’s efforts to promote and strengthen that status through the adoption of the biannual resolution on Mongolia’s international security and nuclear-weapon-free status. The parallel declarations in 2012 by Mongolia and the five nuclear-weapon States on Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free status were a concrete contribution to nuclear disarmament, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the enhancement of confidence in our region.

Mongolia considers that nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and the establishment of nuclear-

weapon-free zones are the best and most effective means of building a world free of nuclear weapons. We believe that the international recognition of Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free status reflects our tangible contribution to that cause through our efforts.

I therefore reiterate my Government’s strong commitment to and support for the efforts of the international community and its assurance that my country will continue to further enhance its cooperation with the United Nations and Member States in contributing to our shared goal of a world free of nuclear weapons.

On behalf of all co-sponsors, may I express our hope that as in previous years, the Committee will adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

**Mr. Sivamohan** (Malaysia): The advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons* (A/51/218, annex) remains a crucial milestone in the collective efforts of the international community to achieve a world without nuclear weapons.

Recent events demonstrate the continued salience of the ICJ’s seminal opinion more than a quarter century after it was rendered. As the Secretary-General has rightly warned, we are witnessing a time of nuclear danger not seen since the height of the cold war.

The consecutive failure to adopt a substantive outcome at the ninth and tenth Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, held in 2015 and 2022, respectively, is indeed cause for great concern. The Treaty is arguably in a state of crisis, which, if not addressed expeditiously, will affect its integrity and credibility.

Amid heightened geopolitical tensions, Malaysia believes that it is vital for the global community to continue to underline the Court’s unanimous conclusion that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.

In that regard, Malaysia is honoured to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.22, under sub-item (k) of agenda item 99, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons”. The advisory opinion of the Court remains a significant contribution to the field of nuclear disarmament, and its



humanitarian context highlights the moral imperative of the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

With a view to achieving the broadest possible support, minimal updates have been introduced to the resolution that was adopted last year (resolution 76/53). Malaysia expresses its appreciation to all delegations that have co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.22, and we invite other Member States to co-sponsor and support that initiative.

**Mrs. Romero López** (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): We are taking the floor in order to make a general statement under this cluster, “Nuclear weapons”.

We urge delegations to vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.7, A/C.1/77/L.13, A/C.1/77/L.17, A/C.1/77/L.22, A/C.1/77/L.37, A/C.1/77/L.42 and A/C.1/77/L.58, as well as of any specific paragraphs of those drafts on which a separate vote may be called.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.7, entitled “Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament”, we would recall that that initiative of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries made it possible for every 26 September to be commemorated as the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. That event is an appropriate forum for promoting the goal of bringing about a world free of nuclear weapons.

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.17, entitled “Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons”, welcomes the historic convening of the first Meeting of States Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, the first legally binding instrument that stresses the illegal nature of that type of weapon. That instrument proscribes the use, existence and development of nuclear weapons; stresses that they are inhumane, immoral and ethically indefensible; and strengthens and complements the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in particular the application of its article VI.

We call once again on those Member States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Treaty as quickly as possible. We reiterate that the only way of averting the dreadful impact of nuclear weapons is to eliminate them totally in a verifiable, transparent and irreversible fashion.

To conclude, we wish to express our view that draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.42, entitled “Nuclear disarmament”, remains one of the texts that best deals

with the issue of nuclear disarmament, which is and should continue to be the greatest priority in the field of disarmament.

**The Chair:** Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions and decisions under cluster 1, we will hear from delegations wishing to explain their position on those drafts.

**Mr. Mabhongo** (South Africa): I take the floor in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.61, entitled “Steps to building a common roadmap towards a world without nuclear weapons”. South Africa will be voting against that draft resolution and key paragraphs contained therein.

South Africa has traditionally not voted against draft resolutions in the First Committee, but we are left with no choice but to do so on this occasion. We have taken note of the efforts of the delegation of Japan to expand this draft resolution by building on selected elements of the draft final outcome document of the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which was not adopted.

At the conclusion of the tenth NPT Review Conference, South Africa expressed its deep regret at yet another failed Review Conference, which marked an unprecedented consecutive failure to adopt an outcome on the implementation of the Treaty. Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.61 does not acknowledge that most salient fact or reflect the challenge that that will present to the integrity of the NPT.

The NPT remains the cornerstone of the global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation architecture, and the framework for international cooperation in sharing the benefits of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, science, and technology. The key to the future, strength, credibility and vitality of the NPT rests on the fundamental bargain across its mutually reinforcing three pillars, which must be recognized and upheld.

The proposed draft resolution, however, attempts to renege on that bargain and undo the foundation of the NPT and its indefinite extension. South Africa is concerned that the draft resolution, in a number of its key paragraphs, conspicuously and deliberately omits the obligations of nuclear-weapon States related to their unequivocal undertakings to disarm.

The focus on nuclear disarmament is scant, with the draft resolution setting the bar for the first Preparatory

Committee of the eleventh Review Conference so low that the possibility of progressing on nuclear disarmament already seems unattainable.

The manner in which the draft resolution is framed creates further distance between nuclear-disarmament commitments and the advent of a world without nuclear weapons. Not only does the draft resolution expect Member States to take gradual steps; it also wants to require Member States to build a common road map moving towards, but never attaining, a world without nuclear weapons.

We believe that the draft resolution constitutes a step in the wrong direction. It neglects the urgent need for nuclear disarmament. Given the catastrophic impact of the testing, use and threat of use of nuclear weapons, only one step is required on nuclear disarmament, and that is urgent, time-bound actions.

The draft resolution sets the disarmament agenda back, creating conditionalities for disarmament that can never be reached. It tries to make the retention of nuclear weapons more palatable by reducing the risk of keeping, maintaining and modernizing them. It also reinforces qualifications on security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

In conclusion, if this is the basis on which to move towards the next review cycle of the NPT, it does not bode well for the future of the Treaty and calls into question the credibility of its indefinite extension. It is for that reason, and in order to defend the nuclear taboo, which has been eroded by more and more States becoming part of extended nuclear security guarantees and buying into the deterrence doctrine, that South Africa is voting against this draft resolution and key paragraphs contained therein.

**Mr. Turner** (United States of America): I would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.2 and draft decision A/C.1/77/L.38.

My delegation will vote against A/C.1/77/L.2 because it wrongly singles out one State of the region that is in full compliance with its obligations while ignoring serious nuclear proliferation and compliance challenges in the region.

The Middle East faces significant nuclear-proliferation risks, foremost among them Iran's nuclear escalations, including actions with no credible civilian justification. As called for by the International Atomic

Energy Agency (IAEA) Board of Governors, Iran must urgently cooperate with the IAEA to resolve outstanding safeguards concerns over possible undeclared nuclear material and activities.

Syria has been in non-compliance with its IAEA safeguards agreement and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) for more than a decade and still refuses to cooperate with the IAEA's investigation. Far too many States of the region have yet to sign and bring into force an additional protocol or to rescind or modify their outdated small-quantities protocols, despite, in some cases, pursuing significant nuclear-power plans. Even more troubling, some officials in the region have made public comments that question their commitment to their State's NPT obligations.

We cannot endorse a draft resolution that focuses solely on regional NPT universality while ignoring compliance concerns. We would take a similar view where a draft resolution on the risk of chemical-weapons proliferation in the Middle East was put forward that solely called on one State of the region that has not yet done so to sign the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) while ignoring Syria's blatant disregard for its CWC obligations.

We encourage all States of the region to pursue dialogue and confidence-building measures with their neighbours rather than divisive resolutions that are out of touch with regional security and political realities.

On draft decision A/C.1/77/L.38, for Iran to attempt to assert leadership on the global stage to prevent the proliferation of ballistic missiles is the height of hypocrisy. Given Iran's own long-standing and deeply troubling record of ballistic-missile proliferation, in violation of multiple Security Council resolutions, it is disappointing that any country would make common cause with Tehran on draft decision A/C.1/77/L.38.

For that reason, my delegation will vote no on draft decision A/C.1/77/L.38. We urge all responsible States to join the United States in voting against that hypocritical draft decision.

**Mr. Sharoni** (Israel): I would like to deliver an explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.1 and A/C.1/77/L.2 draft resolution and draft decision A/C.1/77/L.38.

It took a long time and considerable international efforts to reach consensus in the past on resolution

A/C.1/77/ L.1, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. It is regrettable that consensus is no longer achievable due to one-sided actions by the Group of Arab States.

Israel attaches high importance to the non-proliferation regime and shares its goals. Nevertheless, the geopolitical situation in the Middle East, with a widespread culture of non-compliance, clearly demonstrates that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) per se does not provide the remedy to the unique security challenges of the region.

Even though Israel had its own deep reservations on the language and modalities of the draft resolution, which have been voiced every year in our explanation of position, Israel supported that resolution in the spirit of consensus as part of Israel's constructive and consensus-oriented approach.

It is very unfortunate that that long-standing practice was broken by the Arab Group. By imposing a new unilateral and unconstructive resolution in 2018, the Arab Group embarked on a process that has altered the status quo and forced Israel to dissociate itself from the draft resolution.

Experience gained from other regions demonstrates that any framework for regional security can only be the outcome of a mutual political desire of all regional parties to engage with one another, taking into consideration the security concerns of each and every State and reflecting the arrangements freely arrived at by all States concerned, as stipulated in the 1999 Disarmament Commission report on guidelines and principles for a nuclear-weapon-free zone (A/54/42). The ill-motivated conference clearly fails to do so.

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", on which Israel will vote against, has been submitted once again by the Arab Group. That is an unfortunate attempt to divert the First Committee's attention away from the real proliferation challenges facing the Middle East. That approach serves neither the interests of the States of the region nor those of the international community.

This draft resolution is detached from reality. First and foremost, it fails to genuinely confront the real risks related to weapons of mass destruction in the region. It also undermines any attempt to address regional

threats effectively and curtails chances for a real and constructive dialogue between the States of the region.

In that regard, it is important to recall that certain countries in the region have evidently violated their NPT obligations and embarked on a clandestine military nuclear programme, violating their international and non-proliferation obligations. Furthermore, the sponsors of the draft resolution clearly overlooked Iran's continued aspirations for nuclear weapons and Syria's clandestine nuclear programme.

It is clear that the sponsors of the draft resolution have misdirected their efforts. Iran and its allies are the real risks of the Middle East, not Israel. We reject this draft resolution in its entirety. Attempts to divert the world's attention by submitting a one-sided and biased draft resolution in a multilateral forum will not succeed. They will most certainly not contribute to a positive atmosphere in the region.

Finally, on draft decision A/C.1/77/L.38, entitled "Missiles", this year once again we are confronted with the same baffling situation whereby Iran is the sponsor of a draft decision pertaining to missiles and, to top it off, in the nuclear cluster. Iran is a violator of the NPT that refuses to cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency or answer questions on its clandestine nuclear programme and continues to advance its military nuclear programme ambitions. Furthermore, Iran is also violating several Security Council resolutions on arms-control instruments on missile proliferation as well, due to its heavy involvement in the proliferation of missiles and rockets to numerous terrorist organizations in the Middle East and its active programme for weapons of mass destruction-capable warheads.

It is inconceivable that Iran is sponsoring a draft decision on missiles. Therefore, Israel asked for a vote to stop this hypocrisy and vote against this draft.

**Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to explain the position of the Russian Federation on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.61, entitled "Steps to building a common roadmap towards a world without nuclear weapons".

We believe that the sponsors of the draft were not able to achieve the goal that they set for themselves, that is, to propose an effective yet realistic road map to help us move toward a world free of nuclear weapons. In addition, it is deeply unfortunate that the draft resolution, which has always been presented by the

authors as an effort to build bridges, this year clearly has a confrontational note.

We fundamentally disagree with the assertion that it contains the key productive developments from the draft outcome document of the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We believe that it would be premature to decide to use, in preparing a draft resolution, another draft on which there is still no consensus.

It turns out that that “common road map”, which is supposed to consolidate the efforts of countries, contains underdeveloped ideas over which there was heated debate at the Review Conference. We fundamentally disagree with that approach and cannot support it.

Instead of analysing the experience of the NPT Review Conference and creatively rethinking it, the sponsors essentially are proposing that we approve this very same document of the Review Conference, as they borrow entire passages from it. Those are the most controversial and, most importantly, the most politicized passages.

But now these passages are supposed to be approved at the level of the General Assembly. I am speaking in particular about the entirely imbalanced text in the ninth preambular paragraph, where incorrectly and using careless language they highlight only one of the documents from the 1994 packet of agreements on security guarantees to a number of countries in relation to their accession to the NPT, and they ignore the context of the practical implementation of that document.

They did not take into account proposals to refrain from confrontational language in the fifth preambular paragraph on the blocking of the outcome document of the NPT Review Conference and instead express regret that two Review Conferences in a row had ended without any progress made. In a similar situation in 2015, the sponsors had thus reflected the outcome of the ninth NPT Review Conference, as set out in the twelfth preambular paragraph of resolution 70/40.

The refusal of the sponsors to entertain reasonable amendments that would have balanced the text have convinced us even further that their goal was never to seek compromises. That provocative approach troubles us deeply, including in the context of prospects for

future work on multilateral platforms on the topic of nuclear disarmament.

In addition to the clearly divisive provisions in the draft resolution, it also includes a number of other passages that are unlikely to obtain consensus and that are rather poorly formulated. Here I refer to the language on the issues of transparency and accountability, multilateral verification of nuclear disarmament, the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons and certain regional topics.

In addition, the text once again lacks a fundamental understanding of the fact that nuclear disarmament must take place in the context of general and complete disarmament, as is laid out in article VI of the NPT. It only partially reflects a very important point: that progress in that area depends on the international security situation. It is critically important that documents that claim to seek collective solutions to achieve nuclear disarmament ought first and foremost to underscore the importance of examining factors that have a negative impact on international security and stability, as well as the fact that moving toward a nuclear-weapon-free world should take place gradually and in such a manner as to facilitate the strengthening of international peace and security.

Outside of the historical context, the draft resolution highlights the issue of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the suffering of its victims, the hibakusha. Here it is easy to see Tokyo's efforts to present itself purely as a victim in that situation while erasing from history the role of militarized Japan in unleashing the Second World War and recollections about the actions of the Japanese armed forces during that conflict. This topic is extremely sensitive for many countries and requires extremely careful and well-calibrated treatment.

At the same time, for many years the sponsors have been carefully avoiding mention of the fact that the atomic bombing was carried out by the United States, which is the first and only country to have used nuclear weapons in military activities, which to put it lightly, had a rather dubious military benefit.

In conclusion, I would like to say that for us the fundamental flaws in this document far outweigh the few positive points that it contains. Therefore, we plan to vote against the proposed draft resolution.



**The Chair:** I must most respectfully remind representatives that we need to keep to our time limits, because we have nine interventions and our target is 4.30 p.m. I would therefore ask representatives to be very cooperative in that respect.

**Mr. Kim In Chol** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation is taking the floor to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.61, entitled "Steps to building a common roadmap towards a world without nuclear weapons".

We would like to draw the attention of the international community to the fact that Japan has an ulterior motive in the context of the political and military spectrum by sponsoring the draft resolution. It is outrageous that Japan continues to disguise itself as a victim of the Second World War while persistently refusing to provide any sincere apology or reparations for its history of aggression and crimes against humanity.

The Korean and Asian peoples still vividly remember the immeasurable suffering inflicted by Japan. Japan must squarely face up to history, refrain from deceiving the international community under the veil of an atomic-bomb victim and provide a heartfelt apology and reparations for its past wrongdoings.

Japan is also strongly urged to refrain from pursuing its wider ambition of becoming a military Power. It is deeply alarming that Japan is scheming to revise its Constitution, intended exclusively for home defence, and transform its defence strategy to possess pre-emptive strike capability. To that end, it is significantly increasing its military expenditure to develop, manufacture and deploy advanced weaponry systems. Moreover, Japan is actively involved in various kinds of joint military drills with the United States in hot regions.

The ultimate goal of Japan is to realize its old pipe dream of a Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere through reinvasion. Worse still, Japan is constantly importing and stockpiling a large quantity of plutonium and uranium. Today the Japanese political circle is openly clamouring for the examination of the three non-nuclear principles and the introduction of nuclear sharing with the United States.

Japan is not entitled to find fault with the steps taken by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to bolster its defence capabilities, as they constitute an entirely just exercise of its right to self-defence

aimed at thwarting military threats from outside forces and reliably preserve security and peace on the Korean peninsula.

We reiterate our total rejection of Security Council resolutions that flagrantly violate our sovereignty and right to development and existence. Japan is now further amplifying the alleged external threats in order to conceal its belligerency and justify its stepped-up militaristic moves. Japan should dismantle all the offensive weapons it has already deployed or that are under development for invasion in a complete, verifiable and irreversible way instead of accusing others.

We call on the international community to look closely at Japan's aggressive identity and stay on high alert with respect to its dangerous move towards invasion. We strongly urge Japan to immediately stop its dangerous attempt to discharge nuclear-contaminated water, which will take a heavy toll on neighbouring countries and Pacific Island States and undermine the ecosystem of the Blue Pacific.

In that context, my delegation categorically rejects and will vote against the draft resolution sponsored by Japan.

**Mr. Li Song** (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): Before I explain China's voting position on the relevant draft resolutions, it is necessary to draw the attention of members to the *2022 Nuclear Posture Review*, published by the United States yesterday. That document can give us a clear idea as to how the United States, with nuclear weapons in its hands, views the world and other countries.

That report painstakingly plays up competition among major Powers and bloc confrontation. It is steeped in a cold-war mentality and zero-sum-game thinking, reflecting the hegemonic logic of the United States in seeking absolute military superiority, which runs counter to the international aspiration to prevent nuclear war and a nuclear arms race.

The United States has further strengthened the role of nuclear weapons in its national security doctrine and lowered the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons, increasingly making itself the very source of risks for nuclear conflict. The newly unveiled nuclear strategy and the relevant policies and plans of the United States will have a complex and far-reaching negative impact on global strategic security and stability as well as strategic security relations among major countries,

and on the international and multilateral nuclear arms-control, disarmament and non-proliferation processes.

In the same report, the United States pontificated and offered conjectures on China's normal nuclear-strength modernization effort and has the audacity to tailor a nuclear-deterrent strategy targeting China. China wishes to register our serious concern and categorical rejection. We advise the United States not to project its hegemonic mindset onto China or, for that matter, onto any other country —

**The Chair:** I interrupt the representative of China and give the floor to the representative of the United States on a point of order.

**Mr. Turner** (United States of America): My understanding was that this section had to do with explanations of vote and not with general statements directed against a particular country.

**The Chair:** The point of order is noted. I ask the representative of China to take appropriate cognizance of that point of order.

**Mr. Li Song** (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): This statement is being made in the context of this cluster and in the framework of our explanation of position, and I am going to touch on China's voting position. I do not want my statement to be interrupted again by other countries.

I reiterate that we advise the United States not to project its hegemonic mindset onto China or, for that matter, onto any other country. China is not the United States and will not develop into another United States, nor will China pursue the nuclear strategy of the United States. Meanwhile, China has the ability and confidence to safeguard its national security interests. The nuclear blackmail of the United States cannot intimidate China. We urge the United States to abandon its cold-war mentality and hegemonic logic, adopt a rational and responsible nuclear policy —

**The Chair:** Once again, I give the floor to the representative of the United States on a point of order.

**Mr. Turner** (United States of America): The Chinese representative should be explaining his vote. He should not be continuing an attack on the United States that has nothing to do with his vote.

**The Chair:** The point is noted. I would request the representative of China to take due note of the point of order that has been raised.

**Mr. Li Song** (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): This statement's exact goal is to explain the logic behind our voting position on the relevant draft resolutions. We hope that the United States will faithfully fulfil its primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament and plays its due role in maintaining global strategic stability and enhancing world peace and security.

I now wish to present our delegation's position on draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.17 and A/C.1/77/L.61.

China has always supported the complete prohibition on and total elimination of nuclear weapons and the final achievement of a nuclear-weapon-free world. China's nuclear strategy and policy are highly stable, consistent and predictable, making it the most responsible and transparent among all nuclear-weapon States.

China's unconditional non-first-use and negative security assurance policy has always been its unique contribution to the international nuclear arms-control and disarmament process. China's nuclear strength remains at the minimum level required for national security. China does not engage in an arms race with any nuclear-weapon State.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.17, China endorses the purpose of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons and understands the aspirations and demands of non-nuclear-weapon States to advance nuclear disarmament. Nevertheless, the nuclear-disarmament process advocated in this draft resolution is divorced from the international security reality and runs counter to the principles of maintaining global strategic stability, undiminished security for all and gradual nuclear disarmament. China cannot accept that.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.61, it must be pointed out that the draft final document of the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons involves a wide range of issues across the three pillars of the Treaty and should be an organic whole that balances the interests and concerns of all parties. That said, many countries, despite their divergent views and positions, agree that the draft document is far from a balanced one. That non-consensual document cannot constitute a basis for reference or precedent. Cherry-picking is even more inadvisable.

In addition, China has serious concerns about references to visits to the sites of nuclear explosions and to nuclear transparency in the draft resolution.

In view of the foregoing, China will vote against draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.17 and A/C.1/77/L.61 and will also explain its position and attitude during the separate votes on specific paragraphs.

**Mr. Sarwani (Pakistan):** I wish to share Pakistan's explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.58 and A/C.1/77/L.57, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger" and "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", respectively.

Pakistan has consistently signalled its willingness to consider and has proposed measures for restraint, confidence-building, risk reduction and the avoidance of an arms race in South Asia. We also continue to support international arms-control and disarmament initiatives that are equitable and non-discriminatory in character.

However, progress on those initiatives has been impeded due to stonewalling and security challenges at the global and regional levels. Unfortunately, the sponsor of the two draft resolutions has itself been engaged in actions that increase rather than reduce nuclear danger in South Asia. The sponsor continues to expand and modernize its conventional and nuclear arsenals. It has increased the readiness of nuclear forces through the canisterization of missiles and the induction of destabilizing weapons systems. It has nuclearized the Indian Ocean through the so-called deterrence patrols with nuclear submarines.

The sponsor has also continuously sought to try to create space for the dangerous doctrine of a limited war under the nuclear overhang. The narrative that limited conventional conflict is possible under the nuclear threshold without any risk of escalation is dangerous, and all must be disabused of it.

The sponsor of these draft resolutions has implemented aggressive and destabilizing force postures and security doctrines that are offensive by design. A conflict between nuclear-armed States must be avoided at all costs. Pakistan has always maintained that declaratory commitments such as the non-first use of nuclear weapons or doctrines are not credible, especially when accompanied by nuclear escalation and threats of the use of nuclear weapons against neighbouring States. The defence planning of states

looks at actual capabilities, force configurations and the postures of adversaries rather than their declarations. The continued escalatory and aggressive actions of the sponsor reveal the contradictions between its misleading declarations and its actual hostile postures and actions.

The reckless launch of a supersonic missile by that country earlier this year into Pakistan's territory and its continued evasion of any meaningful response to the legitimate queries of my country is yet another testament to its hollow grandstanding and the ever-widening chasm between its stated proclamations and its actual designs and acts. For those reasons, we will not be in a position to support those draft resolutions.

Now let me also share Pakistan's explanation of vote on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/77/L.16 and A/C.1/77/L.46.

Pakistan understands the growing unease at the lack of progress in securing the fulfilment of nuclear-disarmament obligations. We regret the withdrawal from and, dismantlement of, several important instruments designed to counter a nuclear-arms escalation. We are mindful of the concerns associated with the humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. Accordingly, Pakistan participated in the three international conferences held on this subject in 2013 and 2014. Nonetheless, we believe that the discourse on nuclear weapons cannot be reduced solely to its humanitarian and ethical dimensions by trivializing and sidestepping the fundamental and legitimate security concerns of those States that are obliged to rely on nuclear weapons to deter aggression.

Pakistan underscores the need for a united approach and endeavour towards nuclear disarmament based on the cardinal principle of ensuring equal and undiminished security for all States, as enshrined in the consensus Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD I) (resolution S-10/2). Therefore, my delegation will abstain in the voting on A/C.1/77/L.16 and A/C.1/77/L.46.

Regarding the draft proposal contained in document A/C.1/77/L.22, on the resolution as a whole, my delegation will once again vote in favour. We will, however, abstain on the eighteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2, which reference a divisive and non-universal initiative. Pakistan did not take part in the negotiations on the Treaty on the

Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons owing to its various conspicuous procedural and substantive shortcomings, on which we have elaborated on various occasions.

Pakistan is committed to the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world through the conclusion of a universal, verifiable and non-discriminatory comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons in the Conference on Disarmament, consistent with the universally agreed principles in the consensus outcome document of SSOD I.

**The Chair:** Can I again request representatives to most respectfully confine themselves to explanations of vote before the voting, notwithstanding the fact that it might be very tempting to say something additional. Please let us try to adhere to the rules.

**Mrs. Petit (France)** (*spoke in French*): I would like to deliver two brief explanations of vote, the first on behalf of France on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.61, entitled “Steps to building a common roadmap towards a world without nuclear weapons”. We thank Japan for its efforts in preparing this draft resolution, which is vital in proposing a gradual and realistic path towards nuclear disarmament. We will vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, but we will abstain on the thirteenth and fourteenth preambular paragraphs.

The text submitted for the approval of members poses for us the major problem of including a reference to the entry into force and to the first Meeting of States parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW). As members are aware, France believes that the TPNW is neither complementary to nor compatible with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which should govern our collective efforts towards a world without nuclear weapons.

The other problem for us is the assertion that efforts towards nuclear disarmament should be carried out only with respect to the humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. We believe that nuclear disarmament, in order to be realistic and credible, cannot neglect the strategic context that we all share. We regret being unable to vote in a unified manner on the draft resolution, but we remain strongly committed to the concept of a nuclear disarmament based on the NPT and its article VI.

The second explanation of vote is delivered on behalf of France, the United States and the United Kingdom to explain our vote against draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.17, entitled “Treaty on the Prohibition of

Nuclear Weapons”. We reiterate our position with regard to that Treaty. We are strongly convinced that the best way to achieve a world without nuclear weapons is to follow a gradual process that takes into account the international security environment and is based on the principle of undiminished and increased security for all.

We three countries have taken important measures for nuclear disarmament that have led to tangible results, including major reductions in global stocks of nuclear weapons. The TPNW does not address the key problems that must be resolved in order to achieve lasting global nuclear disarmament. It ignores the context of international security and regional challenges, which are key to making progress towards disarmament and does nothing to increase confidence and transparency among States. It does not meet the highest standards for non-proliferation and does not have any verification mechanism. We do not consider it to be complementary to the NPT. It will not contribute to the attainment of the common goals of the total elimination of nuclear weapons and does not constitute an effective measure according to the definition set out in article VI of the NPT.

We will not support it, we will not sign it, and we will not ratify that Treaty. It is not binding for us or for other countries that are not party to it, and we do not accept the idea that it would contribute to the development of international customary law. It does not establish new norms or standards. We call on all countries that are considering supporting the TPNW to realistically reflect on its effect on international peace and security.

We remain committed, through the NPT, to continued good-faith negotiations on effective measures with regard to nuclear disarmament, as well as on a general and complete disarmament treaty under strict and effective international oversight. We support the ultimate goal of a world without nuclear weapons with undiminished security for all. We are determined to strive to make the international environment more conducive to fresh progress towards nuclear disarmament and to continuing our individual and collective efforts within the framework of the NPT to further the goals and purposes of nuclear disarmament.

**Mr. Kulkarni (India):** On draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”, India believes that the focus of the



draft should be limited to the region that it intends to address. The 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties provides that States are bound by a treaty based on the principle of free consent. The call on those States remaining outside the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to accede to it and to accept International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards on all their nuclear facilities is at variance with that principle. India is not a party to the NPT and is not bound by its outcome documents. That applies also to certain operative paragraphs contained in A/C.1/77/L.2.

On draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.16, entitled “Humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons”, India is voting in favour, consistent with its participation in the four meetings held in Oslo; Nayarit, Mexico; and Vienna on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons. Our participation in those meetings was premised on the shared concern about the serious threat to the survival of humankind that could be posed by the use of nuclear weapons.

On A/C.1/77/L.19, as a country that maintains close, friendly ties with Mongolia, India wishes to state its position on that draft resolution, on Mongolia’s international security and nuclear-weapon-free status. We note the many steps that Mongolia has taken to reinforce such a status and the fact that Mongolia has received support and security assurances for such a status from Member States, particularly those that possess nuclear weapons. India fully respects the choice made by Mongolia and conveys its unambiguous assurance that it will respect Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free status.

On A/C.1/77/L.22, entitled “Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons”, India has been the only State possessing nuclear weapons to have traditionally co-sponsored this resolution in the past. We were disappointed that substantive changes were made to the traditional text of the resolution in 2017. In particular, we were disappointed that references to the early conclusion of a nuclear-weapons convention based on the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention co-submitted by the lead sponsors themselves had been dropped.

Further, the objective of the draft resolution, as reflected in its operative paragraph 2, is ambiguous. Therefore, my delegation had to withdraw its

co-sponsorship and will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

On A/C.1/77/L.30, entitled “African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty”, India respects the sovereign choice of non-nuclear-weapon States to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. That principle is consistent with the provisions of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the guidelines of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

India enjoys friendly and mutually beneficial relations with the countries of the African continent. India shares and supports their aspirations to enhance the region’s well-being and security. We respect the sovereign choice of States parties to the Pelindaba Treaty and welcome the successful entry into force of the Treaty. As a nuclear-weapon State, India conveys its unambiguous assurance that it will respect the status of the African nuclear-weapon-free zone.

**Mr. Sivamohan (Malaysia):** My delegation wishes to provide an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.61, entitled “Steps to building a common roadmap towards a world without nuclear weapons”.

Malaysia thanks Japan for once again having taken the initiative to submit a draft resolution addressing the vital subject of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. We commend Japan for its open and extensive informal consultations.

However, my delegation is not in a position to support the draft resolution as a whole. We believe that the overall framing of the draft does not accord sufficient weight to nuclear disarmament, which remains a pressing imperative.

Malaysia reaffirms that nothing less than the total elimination of nuclear weapons and the assurance that they will never again be produced will suffice as a guarantee against the catastrophic humanitarian consequences that would result from any use of such abhorrent weapons.

In our view, the third preambular paragraph of the present draft does not adequately reflect the nature of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as the cornerstone of the global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime.

We regret that the fifth preambular paragraph does not make reference to the consecutive failure of two NPT Review Conferences to adopt a substantive outcome, which is without precedent since the indefinite extension of the Treaty. The Treaty is arguably in a state of crisis, and that reality must be acknowledged.

As to the sixth preambular paragraph, the phrase “by some nuclear-weapons States” unduly circumscribes the scope of the concern of non-nuclear weapon States.

The eleventh preambular paragraph, regrettably, includes elements of conditionality in relation to nuclear disarmament. It also fails to highlight the particular responsibility of the nuclear-weapon States to pursue nuclear disarmament.

Malaysia welcomes the inclusion of the fourteenth preambular paragraph, on the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. However, that cannot be a panacea to remedy the imbalance in the text as a whole.

Nor can we support operative paragraph 1, as it fails to reflect the existential threat to humankind posed by the very existence of nuclear weapons, let alone any prospect of their use. Urging the nuclear-weapon States to make every effort to prevent such use is wholly inadequate.

Malaysia is deeply concerned by operative paragraph 2, which appears to render all existing security assurances, including legally binding negative security assurances, subject to so-called national statements of undefined nature and scope. That has grave implications for all States that possess negative security assurances, more so for States without them. The solemn undertaking of negative security assurances cannot be unilaterally cast aside by the nuclear-weapon States providing them.

Given recent reports, we cannot support operative paragraph 4, which may be misleading in its reference to an overall decreasing trend of the global stockpile of nuclear weapons. Further, we are unable to vote in favour of operative paragraph 9, as it premises the integrity of the NPT on nuclear non-proliferation obligations without mentioning of nuclear disarmament.

For those reasons, my delegation will abstain in the voting on the third preambular paragraph, the fifth preambular paragraph, the sixth preambular paragraph, the eleventh preambular paragraph, operative paragraph 1, operative paragraph 4 and operative paragraph 9. We will vote against operative paragraph 2.

We fervently hope that Japan will duly consider the concerns expressed by Malaysia as well as by many other non-nuclear-weapon States in future consultations on this critical issue.

**Mr. Balouji** (Islamic Republic of Iran): Iran will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.1. However, we note that the substance of the resolution has not changed for many years due to the desire to maintain consensus. Now, given the inadequate attention accorded the issue in two consecutive Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the frequent negative votes by the Israeli regime and the United States against this draft proposal, it is crystal-clear that the situation has changed.

Therefore, there is no more justification for refraining from updating the substance of the draft resolution. We reiterate our call, for the third year in a row, on the sponsor of the draft resolution to delete the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4, since no such peace negotiations exist in the Middle East and Israel rejects participation in the Conference on the Establishment of a Middle East Zone Free of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction. The draft resolution should include an expression of regret regarding Israel's ongoing defiance of the international community.

Iran will vote in favour of A/C.1/77/L.2, which reflects the concern of the solid majority of States that the Israeli regime, as the only non-party to the NPT in the Middle East, is the source of the nuclear proliferation in that region. There should be no doubt that the risk of nuclear proliferation and the threat of use of such weapons in the Middle East will continue to exist as long as certain Western countries continue to appease Israel's illicit nuclear-weapons programme.

Together with the Israeli regime, the United States is the main culprit regarding any regional insecurity in the Middle East. We reject all its irresponsible actions, though it brazenly and hypocritically tries to pretend otherwise. We fully support the call on Israel to accede to the NPT as a non-nuclear party without further delay, to renounce its possession of nuclear weapons and to place all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency full-scope safeguards.

Iran will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.29 for the following reasons. The Hague Code of Conduct is a discriminatory export-control regime that imposes

restrictions on many goods and technologies as well as equipment and know-how that have peaceful applications. It is not and cannot be considered an internationally negotiated text. It was drafted and adopted outside the United Nations in a selective, non-transparent and unbalanced manner. Even when other countries were invited to participate in the final segment of that process, almost none of their views were taken into account. Therefore, it is an utterly flawed code of conduct with serious substantive shortcomings.

While the existence and development of nuclear-armed ballistic missiles are the main threat to regional and global security, the Hague Code of Conduct is completely silent about that threat and has failed to call for an end to the development of nuclear-armed ballistic missiles by the possessor States.

Accordingly, while the Hague Code of Conduct practically acknowledges the possession of nuclear-armed ballistic missiles by a few Missile Technology Control Regime participants, it aims at discouraging others from possessing conventionally armed ballistic missiles in the exercise of their inherent right to security and self-defence.

The Hague Code of Conduct deliberately fails to distinguish between the space launch vehicle programme and the ballistic-missiles programme. Issues related to missiles have to be addressed comprehensively and in the overall context of general and complete disarmament, within which nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons remain the highest priority.

Concerning A/C.1/77/L.52, Iran will vote in favour. The principal objective of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty is to terminate the development and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and end the development of new, advanced types of nuclear weapons. Twenty-six years after the Treaty's adoption, achieving that objective has become ever more elusive.

Unfortunately, almost all nuclear-weapon States, in particular the United States, are modernizing and qualitatively upgrading their nuclear-weapon systems by using new technologies. While that undermines the Treaty's object and purpose, it is a source of serious regret that no call is made in this draft for nuclear-weapon States to refrain from such measures.

We express our serious reservations on the wording. Verification should be considered as the necessary

preparation for an independent and reliable means to ensure compliance with the Treaty once it enters into force. The benefits of a CTBT global monitoring system shall neither distract our attention from the fundamental objectives of the Treaty nor be used as a pretext for its de facto operationalization.

The full text of our explanations of vote will be submitted to the Secretariat later.

**Mr. Al Ashkar** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): I wish to explain my country's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.1.

Syria has spared no effort to make the Middle East a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. In that context, when Syria was a member of the Security Council, in 2003, we submitted a draft resolution to create such a zone. However, the United States threatened to veto it.

The attempts by the United States and Israel did not succeed in diverting the attention of the international community away from the actual risks of Israel's arsenal of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction to regional peace and security. Nor did those attempts succeed in enhancing the position of the two countries vis-à-vis the elimination of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction from the Middle East. The United States and Israel are obstructing the creation of such a zone, thus maintaining Israel's superiority, with its arsenal of weapons of mass destruction, and keeping them away from any international supervision whatsoever.

The policy of double standards is not the ideal way of achieving progress in the process of eliminating weapons of mass destruction from the Middle East. There are glaring realities in the region that must be dealt with decisively and urgently. There is an enormous arsenal of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in Israel; it is the only party in the region to have such an arsenal at its disposal. All the countries of the region are calling for the creation of a zone free from nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. Only one party is intransigent and threatens to undermine security and stability, constituting an actual threat to the non-proliferation regime and a grave danger to the peoples of the region and their countries.

That is why draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.1 is important. It addresses the dangers of such weapons

possessed by Israel to regional and international peace and security, amid its record of aggression. Israel continues to occupy Arab territories and to defy, as it has for decades, the implementation of United Nations resolutions, particularly Security Council resolutions, which call upon Israel to withdraw from the Arab territories. Despite all that, the United States and its allies continue to cover and protect Israel's actions while disregarding its negative approach, which hinders any serious endeavour to eliminate nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction from the Middle East.

Based on its sincere quest to eliminate those weapons from the Middle East, Syria will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.1 and will cooperate with all other sincere parties towards achieving that goal.

**The Chair:** We will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions.

We will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

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

**Ms. Elliott** (Department for General Assembly and Conference Management): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.1 was submitted by the representative of Egypt on 3 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in that document.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau,

Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Israel

*Abstaining:*

Cameroon, Comoros, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.1 was adopted by 172 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of Azerbaijan, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Tanzania informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chair:** I now call on the representative of Egypt on a point of order.

**Mr. Elhomosany** (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): We are obliged to take the floor on a point of order.

The first outcome of the voting showed that there were 173 votes in favour, but the second outcome on the screen showed 172 votes in favour. During the first vote taken, Member States had finished voting and, after an error by the Secretariat, it would appear that the votes



in favour of the draft resolution were decreased by one vote.

I would therefore ask you, Mr. Chair, on what legal basis the second result was adopted rather than the first result, when the mistake was committed by the Secretariat? My delegation cannot accept these results. Please specify the legal basis for this outcome. I stress once again that the first count was different from the second.

**The Chair:** Permit me to respond to the representative of Egypt. There was not a second vote. There was only one vote, which was closed subsequently. That is crystal clear. There is no confusion on that. I hope that the representative of Egypt will accept this response as a satisfactory explanation to his query, which is well taken. He is entitled to raise the query, and we thank him for doing so. Again, there was no second vote. There was only one vote, that vote was closed only once, and the vote is confirmed. Does that explanation suffice for the representative of Egypt?

**Mr. Elhomosany** (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): With all due respect, Mr. Chair, that is not a legal explanation. It appears that what you are trying to do is justify the mistake made by the representative of the Secretariat, who did not announce the end of the voting. Nevertheless, we knew that the vote had indeed come to an end electronically. I therefore insist on a legal explanation. I will not obstruct the work of this Committee. However, an error was committed by the Secretariat, and it would be useful to prevent such errors from being committed again in future.

**The Chair:** The representative of Egypt's observations are well taken. Let me try to explain it once more.

There is no legal explanation to many things that we do. There is a very nice Latin maxim: *de minimis non curat lex*, meaning "the law does not concern itself with trifles". But, however trifling it may be, the representative's critique is well taken. Let me assure him that the voting was completed, and the machine was locked. Unfortunately, we do not have legal reasons for technology failures. I am fairly sure our human capacity does not permit us to extend ourselves to resolve such a point, as science is known today.

In other words, there was a glitch, we accept it, and it has been put right. There was no substantial prejudice caused by virtue of the voting. Let us do the best we can

to ensure that machines do not fail. And, quite frankly, that is a tall order.

Be that as it may, I offer my apologies for the technical glitch, and I thank the representative of Egypt for bringing it up. We will do all we can to prevent its recurrence in future, subject to our human limitations.

I now call on the representative of Sierra Leone on a point of order.

**Mr. Schenks** (Sierra Leone): I think that the glitch is affecting Sierra Leone, Mr. Chair, because when you showed the list of countries, I did not see my vote reflected. I totally agree with Egypt. I even recall the number 173, and when you put up the list, it was 172. Sierra Leone's vote was not reflected.

I accept your explanation that there is a glitch, and Sierra Leone would like to have its vote reflected.

**The Chair:** I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to proffer an explanation.

**Ms. Elliot** (Secretary of the Committee): With respect to the recent voting, both the Chair and I took the floor to indicate that there were technical difficulties. In fact, once the voting began, as Secretary, speaking on behalf of the Secretariat, I was quite clear as to what we were voting on, indicating both the symbol and title of the draft resolution. I indicated that the voting machine was unlocked, and I asked the delegations to kindly indicate their votes on the board. In fact, I gave all delegations 20 seconds to look and confirm that their votes were accurately reflected on the board. If their vote was not reflected on the board, they had an opportunity during that time to press the speaker button to raise their hand on a point of order to indicate that, unfortunately, their vote was not reflected on the board. That was not done.

At the end of the voting, after asking delegations to confirm that, I indicated that the voting had now been completed and that the machine was locked. Fortunately, or unfortunately, it is not the Secretariat that computes the votes after the computer is locked. The computer would have indicated the votes on the screen, and the Chair read the votes on the screen.

If delegations would like to submit a voting intention because their vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.1 was not reflected, as the Secretariat, we would be more than happy to receive those voting intentions and to reflect them in the final record.

Once again, our apologies for the technical difficulties, but I would like to reassure all delegations here that the voting process was indeed conducted in the manner in which it should have been.

**The Chair:** Would anyone else wish to take the floor?

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

**Mr. Moharram** (Saudi Arabia) (*spoke in Arabic*): As one of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.1, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia supports the statement made by the representative of the sisterly Arab Republic of Egypt.

**The Chair:** There is something that we need to bear in mind. With all respect, we must appreciate that this is the voting stage, and that this is not the opportunity to make statements with regard to substantive matters and the rationale behind a delegation's vote or the manner of voting and so on and so forth. That is important to remember. I think that there is a very clear explanation as to the *modus operandi* of this particular procedure. I cannot see any substantial prejudice that has been caused except for the fact that there is a very small differential of one vote, which can be corrected. The official record can be corrected at any time by the Member State communicating a written document to establish the fact that their vote had to be exercised in a particular way. That will be reflected in the final count.

I think that that would perhaps meet the ends of justice, or perhaps the ends of the whole purpose of the voting, and I hope that members will approach it in that spirit. Let us not get too legalistic. I think that the spirit of the law is also important, and that is sometimes perhaps more important than the letter of the law, because the voting took place with transparency. There was a technical glitch, and, if there is a divergence in that voting pattern, and that can be easily corrected — and we can correct it in the manner that has been explained — I strongly suggest, with all respect, that we resort to that default procedure and have the error corrected. Let us get on with our voting. That is what is important. I am sure that I can leave it to the good senses of the Committee members to agree with me and permit me the indulgence of getting on with the voting procedure. I see no disagreement with what I suggested.

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

**Mr. Elhomosany** (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): As I mentioned, this is not to obstruct the work of the Committee, but I would like the meeting's record to reflect that the Secretariat did not explicitly note that the voting had been repeated when the screen was on another time. The Secretariat should have clarified that the voting process was taking place for another time. That is what led to a difference in the numbers of the votes and to some misunderstandings. I would like that to be reflected in the record as a statement by the delegation of Egypt.

**The Chair:** I can say that the position of the representative of Egypt will be reflected verbatim, and that it was his position that there was no clear communication regarding the fact that the voting was taking place for the second time, and that was peculiarly his position. But we will also record the fact that the voting was actually not complete. It was recorded. We will record that fact too, but the position of the representative of Egypt will be reflected verbatim, exactly in the way that he said it. I am most grateful to him. That is therefore sorted out.

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

**Mr. Alqaisi** (Jordan) (*spoke in Arabic*): I support the representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt. We voted twice on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.1. Unfortunately, only the second time was counted as valid, and that was not sufficiently clarified by the Secretariat.

**The Chair:** On behalf of the Secretariat, and perhaps all of us here, may I convey our apologies if there was any confusion in delegations' minds. If what we did led to some confusion in their own minds, I apologize for that, and I ask delegations to accept the explanation that I am giving to allow us to get on with the voting. We will ensure that there is greater clarity next time so that there is not any confusion with regard to how the voting took place.

I thank the representatives of Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia for raising this matter, because these are little things from which lessons can be learned. That is important, because we will probably not make a mistake again.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.2, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.2 was submitted on 3 October by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the League of Arab States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.2.

**The Chair:** Separate votes have been requested on the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs of A/C.1/77/L.2. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I shall first put to the vote the fifth 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, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and

the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, 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, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Bhutan, Côte d'Ivoire, Georgia, Madagascar, Papua New Guinea, Sierra Leone, United States of America

*The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 164 votes to 4, with 7 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** I shall now put to the vote 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, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, 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, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, 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, Tuvalu, 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:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Bhutan, Côte d'Ivoire, Georgia, Madagascar, Papua New Guinea, Sierra Leone, United States of America

*The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 160 votes to 4, with 7 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.2, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras,

Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, 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, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Canada, Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, India, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Romania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.2, as a whole, was adopted by 152 votes to 5, with 24 abstentions.*

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

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.7, entitled "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.7 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.7.

The present oral statement is made in the context of rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and will also be distributed to Member States. Under the terms of paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly will decide to convene in New York, on a date to be decided later, a United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament to review the progress made in that regard. The adoption of the draft resolution would not entail any budgetary implications with regard to the programme budget. Upon a decision on the modalities of the conference, the Secretary-General would assess the budgetary implications and advise the General Assembly in accordance with rule 153 of its rules of procedure. Furthermore, in accordance with established practice, the date of the conference would be determined in consultation with the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management.

**The Chair:** Separate votes have been requested on the sixth, twelfth and fourteenth preambular paragraphs of A/C.1/77/L.7. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

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

Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Israel, Republic of Korea, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Monaco, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 141 votes to 3, with 26 abstentions.*

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

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea,

Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Croatia, Estonia, France, Greece, Israel, Lithuania, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Slovenia, Sweden, Türkiye, Ukraine, United States of America

*The twelfth preambular paragraph was retained by 126 votes to 17, with 23 abstentions.*

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

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

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo,

Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cyprus, Georgia, Ireland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Malta, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Switzerland, Ukraine

*The fourteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 115 votes to 36, with 16 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** We will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.7, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.7, as a whole, was adopted by 138 votes to 34, with 9 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.13, entitled "Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.13 was submitted on 3 October by the representative of Mexico. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.13. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Kyrgyzstan has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.13 was adopted.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.16, entitled "Humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.16 was submitted on 4 October by the representatives of Austria, Brazil, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, South Africa and Thailand. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.16. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Chad, the Gambia and Sierra Leone have also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

**The Chair:** The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.16. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas,

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

*Against:*

Czechia, Estonia, France, Hungary, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Türkiye, Ukraine

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.16 was adopted by 141 votes to 12, with 31 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.17, entitled "Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.17 was submitted on 4 October by the representatives of Austria, Brazil, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, South Africa and Thailand. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.17. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Burkina Faso, Chad, Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia have also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Chad informed the Secretariat that it had not intended to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.17.]

The present oral statement is made in the context of rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and will also be distributed to Member States. Under the terms of operative paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly

"notes the establishment of the informal intersessional process to further the implementation of the Treaty"; "confirms that the second Meeting of States Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons will be held at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 27 November to 1 December 2023"; and "requests the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, as may be required, for the second Meeting of States Parties and its informal intersessional process".

With regard to operative paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 of the draft resolution, it is understood that activities related to international conventions or treaties under their respective legal arrangements shall be financed from extrabudgetary funds and may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties and other States not parties but participating in the activities. The second Meeting of States Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, to be held at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 27 November



to 1 December 2023, and its informal intersessional process would therefore be serviced on a reimbursable basis. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.17 would not give rise to any programme budget implications.

**The Chair:** We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.17. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated

States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Türkiye, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Marshall Islands, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Singapore, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Tonga, Ukraine

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.17 was adopted by 124 votes to 43, with 14 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.19, entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.19 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Mongolia. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.19. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Eritrea has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

**The Chair:** The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the First 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.19 was adopted.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.22, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.22 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Malaysia. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.22. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Burkina Faso, Chad and Sierra Leone have also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

**The Chair:** Separate votes have been requested on the tenth and eighteenth preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.22. We shall now begin the voting process. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I shall first put to a vote the tenth preambular paragraph.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

North Macedonia, Russian Federation, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, France, Georgia, Hungary, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*The tenth preambular paragraph was retained by 136 votes to 3, with 29 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** I shall now put to a vote the eighteenth preambular paragraph.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France,

Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Türkiye, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Japan, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Somalia, Switzerland, Ukraine

*The eighteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 113 votes to 38, with 12 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Iceland informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.]

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

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

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

Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, India, Japan, Pakistan, Serbia, Switzerland, Ukraine

*Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 115 votes to 38, with 11 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.22, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

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

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.22, as a whole, was adopted by 133 votes to 35, with 13 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/77/L.26, entitled "Nuclear disarmament verification".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/77/L.26 was submitted on 7 October by the representative of Norway, also on behalf of Brazil, the Netherlands, South Africa, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.26.

**The Chair:** We shall now take action on draft decision A/C.1/77/L.26. A recorded vote has been requested.

*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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, 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, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, 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:*

None



*Abstaining:*

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Syrian Arab Republic

*Draft decision A/C.1/77/L.26 was adopted by 179 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.29, entitled “The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.29 was submitted by the representative of Nigeria on 10 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.29. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Eritrea, Fiji and Lesotho have also become sponsors.

**The Chair:** We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.29. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Albania, 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, Cabo Verde, 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, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, 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, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, China, Cuba, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Indonesia, Lebanon, Pakistan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.29 was adopted by 170 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.30, entitled “African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.30 was submitted by the representative of Nigeria on 10 October on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.30. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Zambia has also become a sponsor.

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.30 was adopted.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.36, entitled

“Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliot** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.36 was submitted by the representative of the Pakistan on 10 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.36. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.36 was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 64 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/77/L.38, entitled “Missiles”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliot** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/77/L.38 was submitted by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on 10 October. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.38.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana,

Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, 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, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Iceland, Israel, Palau, Ukraine, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Australia, Bahrain, Canada, Japan, Malawi, North Macedonia, Panama, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

*Draft decision A/C.1/77/L.38 was adopted by 156 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.42, entitled "Nuclear disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliot** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.42 was submitted by the representative of the Myanmar on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.42. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Eritrea has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

**The Chair:** Separate votes have been requested on the thirty-second preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 16 and 19 of A/C.1/77/L.42. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I shall first put to the vote the thirty-second preambular paragraph.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Bhutan, Georgia, Japan, Madagascar, Mali, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sudan, Switzerland

*The thirty-second preambular paragraph was retained by 107 votes to 41, with 13 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 16.

*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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, 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, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

*Against:*

North Macedonia, Pakistan

*Abstaining:*

Bhutan, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, Georgia, Israel, Madagascar, Monaco, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Operative paragraph 16 was retained by 152 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions.*

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

**The Chair:** I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 19.

*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, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, 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, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines,



Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

India

*Abstaining:*

Belarus, Bhutan, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, Georgia, Israel, Madagascar, Malta, Mauritius, North Macedonia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Operative paragraph 19 was retained by 150 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.42, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka,

Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Ireland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Malta, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Serbia, South Africa, Sudan, Uzbekistan

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.42, as a whole, was adopted by 118 votes to 42, with 20 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "Eleventh Review Conference of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliot** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.45 was submitted by the representative of Argentina on 11 October. Subsequently, a revised draft resolution was submitted on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.45/Rev.1.

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

Under the terms of paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.45/Rev.1, the General Assembly would:

“[take] note of the decision of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, following appropriate consultations, to hold the first session of the Preparatory Committee in 2023 in Vienna, and that the available dates are from 31 July to 11 August;”

and

“[request] the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services as may be required for the eleventh Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee.”

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

It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties, under their respective legal instruments, are to be financed by the State parties. Those activities will be undertaken by the Secretariat only after sufficient funding is received in advance.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.45/Rev.1 would not give rise to any programme budget implications.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been requested.

*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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, 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, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, 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, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, 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:*

None

*Abstaining:*

India, Israel, Pakistan

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.45/Rev.1 was adopted by 175 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.46, entitled “Ethical imperatives for a nuclear-weapon-free world”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.46 was submitted by the representatives of Austria, Brazil, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, South Africa and Thailand on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.46. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

**The Chair:** A separate vote has been requested on the eleventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.46. I shall first put that paragraph to the vote.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Latvia,

Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Bhutan, Georgia, Japan, Malawi, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Switzerland

*The eleventh preambular paragraph was retained by 112 votes to 39, with 13 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.46, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

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

Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, China, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Georgia, India, Japan, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Serbia, Switzerland

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.46, as a whole, was adopted by 131 votes to 37, with 13 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.49, entitled "Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.49 was submitted by the representative of Kyrgyzstan on behalf of Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan on 14 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.49. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.49 was adopted.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.52, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.52 was submitted by the

representative of Australia on behalf of Mexico and New Zealand on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.52. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Kiribati has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

**The Chair:** Separate votes have been requested on the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 1, 5 and 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.52. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I shall first put to the vote the seventh 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, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, 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, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia,



South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Bhutan, India, Israel, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic

*The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 162 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** I shall next put to the vote the eighth 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, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru,

Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India

*Abstaining:*

Bhutan, China, Cuba, Egypt, Israel, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic

*The eighth preambular paragraph was retained by 158 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** I shall next put to the vote 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, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali,

Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India

*Abstaining:*

Bhutan, Egypt, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic

*Operative paragraph 1 was retained by 163 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.*

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

*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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, 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, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

*Abstaining:*

Bhutan, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic

*Operative paragraph 5 was retained by 160 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** I shall next put to the vote operative paragraph 6.

*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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti,

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

*Against:*

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India

*Abstaining:*

Bhutan, Egypt, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic

*Operative paragraph 6 was retained by 163 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** We will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.52, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, 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, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, 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:*

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

*Abstaining:*

India, Mauritius, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.52, as a whole, was adopted by 179 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Sudan 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.57, entitled “Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.57 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of India. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.57. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Kiribati has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

**The Chair:** We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.57. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka,

Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, 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:*

Armenia, Brazil, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Fiji, Guyana, Japan, Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Serbia, Sudan, Thailand

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.57 was adopted by 118 votes to 50, with 14 abstentions.*

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

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.58, entitled “Reducing nuclear danger”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.58 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of India. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.58. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Eritrea has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

**The Chair:** We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.58. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*



*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, 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, Armenia, Belarus, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Georgia, Japan,

Malawi, Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Serbia, Sudan

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.58 was adopted by 120 votes to 49, with 13 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** I have a short announcement. The interpreters will have to leave us now, but we will continue because we have just a few more draft texts on which to vote to complete today's proceedings.

The representative of Equatorial Guinea has asked for the floor on a point of order.

**Mr. Edu Mbasogo** (Equatorial Guinea) (*spoke in Spanish*): Given that there is no interpretation and that I do not understand English, I suggest that the meeting be suspended. I have no idea what we will vote on next, who will speak next or what will be said. We are all representatives of the States Members of the United Nations. Spanish is an official language of the Organization, just like English, French, Arabic and Chinese. If there is no interpretation, the meeting should therefore be suspended.

**The Chair:** The strict response to the point of order raised by the representative of Equatorial Guinea is that we must concede his request, given that he has a disability in being unable to understand the English language. We respect his request.

The representative of Equatorial Guinea speaks Spanish, if I heard him correctly. There is an informal alternative. Would you be comfortable if one of your colleagues were to help you with the language?

**Mr. Edu Mbasogo** (Equatorial Guinea) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mr. Chair, I do not understand what you are saying.

**The Chair:** You are completely right to stand your ground. We agree. Let me then fall back on the rigid alternative, which is the standard procedure. I am afraid that we will have to adjourn the meeting. We will consider our options on Monday morning when we are refreshed and no longer tired.

May I take it that the Committee decides to suspend the meeting now and resume on Monday?

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting was suspended at 6.25 p.m.*