



General Assembly

Seventy-third session

First Committee

30th meeting

Thursday, 8 November 2018, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Jinga. (Romania)

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

Programme of work

The Chair: Before proceeding further, I would like to consult the Committee on its programme of work. As the Committee is certainly aware, with the increased number of votes on draft resolutions and decisions and the high volume of explanations of vote and rights of reply this year, we are well behind schedule for completing our work by tomorrow, Friday, 9 November at 1 p.m.

After consulting with the Bureau, I propose that the Committee convene an additional meeting this afternoon at 3 p.m. to assist us in completing our work in a timely manner. I understand that the Trusteeship Council Chamber is available, with interpretation services.

If there are no comments or objections, may I take it that members agree to scheduling an additional meeting this afternoon?

It was so decided.

Agenda items 93 to 108 (continued)

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

The Chair: The Committee has before it document A/C.1/73/INF/2/Rev.5, which contains updates to informal paper No. 2.

We will now proceed to take action on draft proposals under cluster 5, entitled “Other disarmament measures and international security”.

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

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Allow us to once again express our deepest condolences.

I also take this opportunity to once again express our gratitude to you, Mr. Chair, the Bureau and the Secretariat for the highly professional and responsible work being carried out in the First Committee.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of the host party. It would seem that a very respectful Power was kind enough to agree to host the United Nations Headquarters here in New York. We all placed our trust and confidence in that country, in the conviction that it would facilitate the implementation of our aspirations to respectful intergovernmental dialogue and the interaction of all peoples on equal footing, in order to address global problems on the basis of equal and indivisible security. The responsibilities of the host party would of course, at the very least, include ensuring access for all representatives of Member States to the United Nations platform, without exception. That is an obvious necessity. It is up to States to decide whom they send here, and the responsibility of the host country is to provide unfettered access to the United Nations.

What is the reality of the situation? The host country is blocking access to the United Nations for representatives from delegations with whose views

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



it does not agree. As a result, for more than four months, visa requests have been denied in the case of a key member of the Russian delegation to the First Committee — the Director of the department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that is responsible for the work of the First Committee. That is a very surprising state of affairs and it begs the following question: is the position of the host country of a forum on international affairs so weak that its diplomatic corps really has no other argument than to simply attempt to silence its opponents while closing the doors of the United Nations to those States that it dislikes?

Can my dear friends in the Committee imagine someone standing in front of the doors of the United Nations and blocking any member of the United States delegation from entering? It seems absurd and something that could only happen in a dreadful nightmare, but, if that were to happen, I am sure that the Secretariat would call the police and that deranged individual would simply be taken away, which would probably be the right course of action. Why does the Secretariat and its host country therefore allow such actions with regard to representatives of other States? Are they attempting to take us back to times of discrimination and segregation or to foster behaviour that is unacceptable to civilized people?

Once again, I would like to underscore the fact that the Russian Federation continues to be unable to send a key figure of its Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who is responsible for all events related to arms control, including within the United Nations, here to the United Nations in New York. We hope that the matter will not arise again in the First Committee or in any other body of the United Nations.

I apologize for taking up the time of the First Committee with this matter.

The Chair: I now call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

Ms. Plath (United States of America): I would like to ask under what reference that particular intervention by our Russian colleague was made. We seem to have heard it multiple times, at the beginning of each meeting, so I am confused as to why that was a point of order and why we continue to entertain such behaviour and allow it to take up five to 10 minutes of each meeting.

The Chair: According to the rules of procedure, if a Member State asks to speak on a point of order,

the Chair is obliged to give the floor to the respective delegation without checking in advance what exactly they wish to address.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.11, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.11 was submitted by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, on 8 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.11.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.11 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.1/73/L.11 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.12, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.12 was submitted by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, on 8 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.12.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, 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, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.12 was adopted by 140 votes to 4, with 26 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.13, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control".

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.13 was submitted by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, on 8 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.13.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.13 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.1/73/L.13 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.15, entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation".

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.15 was submitted by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, on 8 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.15.

The main sponsors have informed the Committee of the following oral revision to operative paragraph 4 of the text, which should read as follows:

"Underlines the importance of preserving the existing agreements on arms regulation and disarmament, which constitute an expression of the results of international cooperation and multilateral negotiations in response to the challenges facing humankind".

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.15, as orally revised.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi,

Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, 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, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.15, as orally revised, was adopted by 121 votes to 4, with 51 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.21, entitled "Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control".

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.21 was introduced by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago at the Committee's 22nd meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.21. The additional sponsors of the draft resolution are Equatorial Guinea and Guinea-Bissau.

The Chair: A separate, recorded vote has been requested for the tenth preambular paragraph.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia,

Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Qatar, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

The tenth preambular paragraph was retained by 149 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.21 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.1/73/L.21, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.35, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures".

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.35 was introduced by the representative of Germany on 15 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.35.

The Chair: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.35.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, 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, Cyprus, Czech Republic, 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, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

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

The ninth preambular paragraph was retained by 162 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.35 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.1/73/L.35, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.45, entitled “United Nations Disarmament Information Programme”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.45 was submitted by the representative of Mexico on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.45.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.45 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.1/73/L.45 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.49, entitled “United Nations study on disarmament and non-proliferation education”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.49 was submitted by the representative of Mexico on 16 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.49. The additional sponsors of the draft resolution are Equatorial Guinea and Montenegro.

The Chair: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.49.

I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, 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, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), 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, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Israel, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Operative paragraph 3 was retained by 166 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.49 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.1/73/L.49, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.65/Rev.1, entitled “Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.65 was submitted by the representative of India on 18 October. Subsequently, the revised draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.65/Rev.1 was submitted on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.65/Rev.1.

The main sponsors have informed us of the following oral revision to the twelfth preambular paragraph, which now reads:

“Taking note of the reference in the agenda for disarmament of the Secretary-General to his report on current developments in science and technology and their potential impact on international security and disarmament efforts”.

The additional sponsors of the draft resolution are Guinea and Montenegro.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.65/Rev.1 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.1/73/L.65/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair: I now call on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position after the voting.

Mr. Medeiros Leopoldino (Brazil): At the outset, my delegation would like to express its sincerest

condolences to you, Mr. Chair, on the loss experienced by your family.

Our delegation has asked for the floor to speak in explanation of position regarding draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.65/Rev.1, “Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament”. Brazil voted in favour of the draft resolution as a reflection of its active participation in all discussions on the impact of developments in science and technology on international security and disarmament.

As it is only the second time that the draft resolution was considered by the First Committee, it is natural that some improvements and refinements to its language were still needed. In that context, Brazil actively participated in the informal discussions, with a view to including in the draft resolution a reference to the right of States to develop, produce, otherwise acquire, retain, transfer and use technologies for peaceful purposes, in accordance with international obligations. My delegation originally proposed language for the fifth preambular paragraph that recognized such rights in an unequivocal manner, in line with all multilaterally agreed legally binding instruments on disarmament and non-proliferation. The language proposed by Brazil was included in the fifth preambular paragraph of the original draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.65.

However, in recognition of the efforts made by the main sponsor to maintain consensus on the draft resolution, my delegation has accepted the formulation contained in the fifth preambular paragraph of A/C.1/73/L.65/Rev.1. Although the formulation in question is far from ideal, we believe that it contributes to a more balanced approach. In that respect, our delegation recalls that the right of States to develop, produce, transfer and use technologies for peaceful purposes is explicitly and unequivocally recognized in article X of the Biological Weapons Convention, articles VI and X of the Chemical Weapons Convention, article IV of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the twenty-first preambular paragraph of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

Regarding the third preambular paragraph, our delegation notes that the reference to the need to regulate the transfer of technologies for peaceful uses to address the risk of proliferation by States or non-State actors refers to specific provisions of the relevant international obligations, by which each State is bound.

Mr. Jadoon (Pakistan): We have joined consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.65/Rev.1, “Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament”. I am taking the floor to express our understanding of the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

The fifth preambular paragraph mentions the rights reflected in the relevant international agreements regarding the development, production, transfer and use of technologies for peaceful purposes, in accordance with the relevant international obligations. We consider relevant those international agreements to which we are party and international obligations which respective countries have undertaken.

Science and technology have been recognized as enablers of the Sustainable Development Goals. As such, it is every country’s inalienable and inherent right to develop, utilize and acquire technologies for socioeconomic development and to overcome the challenges of climate change and disease and those relating to water, energy and food security. Proliferation concerns should not become a pretext for denying dual-use technologies, even in instances where recipient States stand ready to provide non-diversion assurances. Such denial is often based on political grounds, with non-proliferation only a secondary consideration. It is important that the right to access technologies for socioeconomic development be ensured on a non-discriminatory basis.

Mr. Cleobury (United Kingdom): First, on behalf of my delegation, may I offer our sincere condolences to you, Sir, on your loss and welcome you back among us here in the First Committee.

I am speaking on behalf of France, the United States and the United Kingdom to explain our negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.12, “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”. This is not a new issue. The environmental and long-term health effects of the use of depleted uranium munitions have been thoroughly investigated by the World Health Organization, the United Nations Environment Programme, the International Atomic Energy Agency, NATO, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the European Commission and others. None of those enquiries has documented long-term environmental or health effects attributable to use of those munitions. It is therefore regrettable that the conclusions of those studies have been ignored and

that the authors are calling for further studies without taking into account the existing research.

It is further regrettable that the sponsors of the draft resolution have failed to quote the response of 2010 from the United Nations Environment Programme in its entirety and tried a partial quotation to strengthen their alleged claim. That quote reads as follows:

“The main scientific findings were consistent across the three assessments. Measurements taken at the depleted uranium sites showed that, even in areas with widespread depleted uranium contamination, the overall levels of radioactivity were low and within acceptable international standards with no immediate dangers from either particle-based or waterborne toxicity” (*A/65/129/Add.1, p. 3*).

Given the lack of tangible evidence to the contrary, we do not recognize the presupposed potential risk to health and the environment and therefore do not support United Nations resolutions that presuppose that depleted uranium is harmful.

Ms. Claringbould (Netherlands): My delegation, too, would like to offer our sincere condolences to you, Sir, and your family on your loss.

The Netherlands voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.12, “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”, in which the Secretary-General is requested to submit an updated report on the subject and to again seek the views of Member States and relevant international organizations on the effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium.

The Netherlands recognizes the need for additional research on the effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium and appreciates that the issue is being discussed in the forum of the United Nations. However, the draft resolution’s reference to the potential harmful effects of the use of depleted-uranium munitions on human health and the environment cannot so far be substantiated by the scientific studies conducted by relevant international organizations such as the World Health Organization. The most important aspect to emerge from the scientific literature of the past 20 years is the disagreement among the different studies carried out on depleted uranium, which are characterized by strong contrasting results.

The armed forces of the Netherlands do not use munitions containing depleted uranium. In the context of international missions, however, it is not impossible that service personnel of the Netherlands may operate in areas in which munitions containing depleted uranium are being or have been used by allies. The health and well-being of our soldiers who are deployed on international missions is under the continued scrutiny of the Government of the Netherlands. Exposure to hazardous materials must be avoided to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. Ghaniei (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain the position of my delegation on two draft resolutions. My delegation joined the consensus in adopting draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.21, entitled “Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control”. However, we would like to place on record that the draft resolution is acceptable to my delegation inasmuch as it is in line with our Constitution, laws, regulations and administrative procedures.

On draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.65/Rev.1, entitled “Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament”, we acknowledge that international transfers of dual-use and high-technology products, services and know-how for peaceful purposes are very important for the socioeconomic development of all societies, in particular developing countries.

At the same time, we share the view that certain military applications of scientific and technological developments can contribute to the development of weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, while facilitating and ensuring the highest number of international transfers of dual-use and high-technology products, services and know-how for peaceful purposes is essential, there is also a need to regulate transfers of dual-use and high-technology products where there are reasonable grounds to believe that they would be used for developing weapons of mass destruction. That requires striking a delicate balance between ensuring respect for the inherent right of each and every State to participate in the fullest possible exchange of dual-use and high-technology products, services and know-how for peaceful purposes and preventing their use in developing weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, in regulating such transfers, the concerns and interests of all States, in particular their legitimate defence requirements, have to be taken into account. That can be ensured only through an inclusive and transparent

process, with the participation of all States, leading to the development of a set of multilaterally negotiated and universally applicable non-discriminatory guidelines.

It is based on that perspective that the Islamic Republic of Iran shares the concerns of developing countries regarding the growing proliferation of ad hoc and exclusive export-control regimes and arrangements for dual-use goods and technologies that deny the inherent rights of developing countries and tend to impede their socioeconomic development. This year the draft resolution has been improved to some extent. However, it still requires further improvements to get back on track as a balanced draft resolution.

Ms. Plath (United States of America): First, let me say, on behalf of Ambassador Wood and our entire delegation, that we express and offer our sincerest condolences to you, Sir, on your loss, and welcome you back to New York. It is wonderful to see you again.

I have asked for the floor to offer an explanation of position on draft resolutions A/C.1/73/L.11, A/C.1/73/L.13, A/C.1/73/L.21 and A/C.1/73/L.35.

The United States did not participate in the First Committee’s action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.11, “Relationship between disarmament and development”. My Government believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues. Accordingly, we do not consider ourselves bound by the final document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development that was adopted in September 1987.

Moreover, the United States did not participate in action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.13, “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”. The United States operates under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms-control and disarmament agreements. We see no direct connection, as stated in the draft resolution, between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control and do not consider this to be a matter germane to the work of the First Committee.

On draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.21, “Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control”, we take this opportunity to make important points of clarification on language related to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. We underscore that the

2030 Agenda is non-binding and does not create or affect rights or obligations under international law; nor does it create any new financial commitments. The United States recognizes the 2030 Agenda as a global framework for sustainable development that can help countries work towards global peace and prosperity. We applaud the call for shared responsibility, including national responsibility, in the 2030 Agenda, and emphasize that all countries have a role to play in achieving its vision.

The 2030 Agenda recognizes that each country must work towards implementation in accordance with its own national policies and priorities. The United States also underscores that paragraph 18 of the 2030 Agenda calls for countries to implement the Agenda in a manner that is consistent with the rights and obligations of States under international law. We also highlight our mutual recognition in paragraph 58 that the implementation of the 2030 Agenda must respect and be without prejudice to the independent mandates of other processes and institutions, including negotiations, and does not prejudice or serve as a precedent for decisions and actions under way in other forums. For example, the Agenda does not represent a commitment to provide new market access for goods and services. Moreover, the Agenda does not interpret or alter any World Trade Organization agreement or decision, including the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights.

Finally, I offer an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.35, "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures". The United States voted against the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. In June, the United States voted against the inclusion of ammunition in the outcome document of the third United Nations Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

The final outcome document of the third Review Conference is, for the most part, a representation of compromises by the United States and other Member States. Yet two paragraphs of the outcome document introduced ammunition into the scope of the Programme of Action — a document that was painstakingly but successfully negotiated in 2001. Full implementation of the Programme of Action by all Member States remains elusive. Adding ammunition

within the scope of the Programme of Action puts the progress of its implementation at risk. Member States must remain focused on implementing existing commitments — commitments on which there was consensus. There was no consensus on the inclusion of ammunition.

Mr. Masmajan (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, like other delegations, allow me to convey our sincerest condolences to you, Sir.

I am taking the floor on behalf of Sweden and my own country, Switzerland, to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.12, "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium".

Our countries voted in favour of the draft resolution. Our delegations delivered an explanation of vote when the draft resolution was last submitted in 2016 (see A/C.1/71/PV.25), which remains valid. In the interests of time, we will not read it again to the First Committee; whoever is interested in its content can find it in the meeting records.

Mr. Sarukhanyan (Armenia): At the outset, my delegation would like to offer its sincere condolences to you, Sir, for your loss.

While the Armenian delegation has joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.11, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", we would like to put on record our reservations relating to its reference to the final document of the eighteenth mid-term ministerial meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (NAM), held in Baku from 3 to 6 April. It is regrettable that paragraph 577 of the final document of the meeting runs counter to the long-established approaches of the international community and contains biased and one-sided formulations that distort the essence of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict and the principles of its peaceful settlement.

Armenia would like to draw the attention of NAM States members to the fact that the negotiation process for the peaceful resolution of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict is taking place within the only internationally agreed and mandated format, namely, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe Minsk Group co-chairmanship comprising France, the Russian Federation and the United States. While making references to the resolution of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict, it is important to adhere to the language

and formulations contained in the proposals of the internationally mandated mediation format and to reject any attempts to misuse the Non-Aligned Movement platform by one Member State in a way that misrepresents and distorts the Nagorno Karabakh peace process.

In light of the all this, the delegation of Armenia would also like to put on record its reservation with regard to the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution on the relationship between disarmament and development. Armenia's position applies to all paragraphs of other draft resolutions of the First Committee containing references to the mid-term ministerial meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement held in Baku. Accordingly, Armenia dissociates itself from those paragraphs.

Mr. Hassan (Egypt): My delegation would like to once again express its deepest condolences to you, Sir.

We would like to add a few comments in the form of an explanation of position on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.65/Rev.1. My delegation associates itself with the explanations of position delivered by the delegations of Pakistan and Iran on the draft resolution. We stress that science and technology have been recognized as essential enablers for sustainable development. As such, it is every country's inalienable and inherent right to develop, utilize and acquire technologies for socioeconomic development. Proliferation concerns should not become a pretext for denying dual-use technologies, even in instances when the recipient State stands ready to provide non-diversion assurances. Such denials are often based on political grounds, and it is important that the right to access technologies for socioeconomic development should be ensured on a non-discriminatory basis.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions adopted under cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security."

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

I shall first give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or introduce draft resolutions or decisions under cluster 6. Delegations are kindly reminded that general statements are limited to five minutes.

I now give the floor to the observer of the European Union.

Mr. Kritikos (European Union): On behalf of the European Union and our colleagues here, I hope that you, Sir, will accept our most sincere condolences for your family's loss, and we welcome you back to New York.

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The candidate countries Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Albania, the country of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the European Free Trade Association country Norway, a member of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia align themselves with this statement.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.30, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", the European Union would like to state the following.

We take note of the draft resolution's paragraph 5, which has again been submitted to maintain consensus on this important draft resolution. It calls on all States of the Mediterranean region that have not yet done so to adhere to all the multilaterally negotiated legal instruments in force related to the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, thus creating the conditions necessary for strengthening peace and cooperation in the region.

We would like to underline that the proposed reference to legal instruments in force does not imply a change to our long-standing position in support of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), which regrettably has not yet entered into force. Promoting the universalization and early entry into force of the CTBT is among the European Union's top priorities. All 28 European Union member States have ratified the Treaty and remain strongly committed to pursuing the achievement of its objectives. On 26 February, a new European Council decision was adopted, with more than €4.5 million pledged to continue the European Union's long-standing support for the strengthening of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization's monitoring and verification capabilities.

The European Union reiterates its call to all States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the CTBT without any preconditions or delay. In particular,

this call is addressed to the eight remaining annex 2 States whose ratification is essential for the Treaty's entry into force. We welcome the latest ratification, by Thailand, which increased the number of ratifications to 167 States. Pending the Treaty's entry into force, we call on all States to maintain moratoriums on nuclear-weapon-test explosions and other nuclear explosions, and to refrain from any actions that would undermine the Treaty's objectives and purpose. In this regard, we call on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to maintain its declared suspension of testing of nuclear weapons and to sign and ratify the CTBT without delay.

Nuclear-weapon-test and all other nuclear explosions represent a serious threat to international peace and security and undermine the global non-proliferation regime. It is important that all State signatories adhere to the objectives of the Treaty. Nonetheless, as long as the CTBT has not entered into force, on-site inspections, an important verification tool, cannot be used. Only the Treaty's entry into force will verifiably outlaw nuclear-weapon-test and any other nuclear explosions. We will therefore continue to take every opportunity to advocate the Treaty's ratification and universalization, including during this session of the First Committee.

Mr. Riquet (France) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, allow me to once again reiterate the condolences of the French delegation to you, Sir, and your family during this difficult time.

I have asked for the floor to clarify that, in its participation in the First Committee at its seventy-third session, France will continue this year to comment on a number of draft resolutions in the same spirit as in previous years. Nevertheless, France rejects any interpretation of texts that indicates a link with the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, which was adopted on 7 July 2017, particularly with regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/73/L.1, A/C.1/73/L.15, A/C.1/73/L.30, A/C.1/73/L.43 and A/C.1/73/L.44.

The Chair: The Committee will now hear delegations wishing to explain their position before we take action on the draft proposals under cluster 6.

Mr. Bourgel (Israel): Allow me first to share our condolences with you, Sir, and your family.

I would like to deliver an explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.30. Israel has asked for a vote on paragraphs 2 and 5, as they do not truly reflect the reality in the Middle East.

With regard to paragraph 2, peace in the Mediterranean is the ultimate goal of the State of Israel. However, this one-dimensional paragraph is misleading. There is no mention of the ongoing use of chemical weapons by the Al-Assad regime, the ongoing missile proliferation by the Iranian regime, the terror unleashed by the Iranian regime or the radical Islamic groups and non-State actors that are terrorizing the entire region, including areas bordering the Mediterranean. The draft resolution legitimizes the atrocities that are perpetuated in our region, as well as dangerous proliferation. Its message is that 800,000 dead in Syria is acceptable, as are the terrorism of Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, Hizbullah terrorism all over Lebanon and now Syria, and the terrorism exported from the Middle East to Europe.

With regard to paragraph 5, Israel believes that joining arms-control treaties should not be an aim or a goal unto itself, because treaties are useless if countries do not abide by them or if they do not actually solve regional issues. Israel believes that the most important element is for the right conditions to be established, creating trust and confidence, security and mutual recognition. Without these conditions, all that is left is falsified delusion doomed for failure. Israel believes that it is time to face reality as it is.

Mr. Ghaniei (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.30, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

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

My delegation will also vote in favour of paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, as it calls for adherence to all the multilaterally negotiated legal instruments on disarmament and non-proliferation, which is in line with the repeated calls by successive Review

Conferences of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) on Israel to accede without delay or any preconditions as a non-nuclear-weapon party to the NPT.

However, my delegation will not participate in the actions of the First Committee and General Assembly on the draft resolution as a whole, as it does not reflect the factual realities in the region and the situation in the occupied territories, including the continued crisis in the occupied territories of Palestine and the extremely severe blockade on the Gaza Strip imposed by the Israeli regime.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft proposals under cluster 6, entitled “Regional disarmament and security”.

We shall first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.5, entitled “Regional disarmament”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.5 was submitted by the representative of Pakistan on 2 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.5.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.5 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.6, entitled “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.6 was submitted by the representative of Pakistan on 2 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.6.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2.

We shall first proceed to vote on operative paragraph 2.

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, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, 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, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Eswatini, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of

Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 127 votes to 2, with 45 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.6 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Russian Federation, Rwanda

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.6, as a whole, was adopted by 179 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.7, entitled "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context".

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.7 was submitted by the representative of Pakistan on 2 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.7.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.7 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.30, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.30 was introduced by the representative of Algeria on 15 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.30. The additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.30 are Guinea-Bissau and Equatorial Guinea.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 2 and 5.

I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Fiji

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 166 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 5.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, 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, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and

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

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Fiji, France

Operative paragraph 5 was retained by 165 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.30 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands,

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.30, as a whole, was adopted by 171 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/73/L.47, entitled "Maintenance of international security — good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe".

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/73/L.47 was submitted by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia on 16 October. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.47.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/73/L.47 was adopted.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to those delegations that wish to make statements in explanations of vote or position after adoption.

Ms. Bhandari (India): First of all, we offer our sincerest condolences to you, Sir, and we welcome you back among us.

I have asked for the floor to explain India's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.6, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels". India voted against the draft resolution and its paragraph 2, which requests the Conference on Disarmament to

consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control. As the world's single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, the Conference has a vocation of negotiating disarmament instruments of global application.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission adopted guidelines and recommendations for regional disarmament by consensus in 1993. There is therefore no need for the Conference on Disarmament to engage in formulating principles on the same subject, at a time when it has several other priority issues on its agenda. Furthermore, we believe that States' security concerns extend beyond narrowly defined regions. Consequently, the notion of preserving balance in defence capabilities in the regional or subregional contexts is both unrealistic and unacceptable to my delegation.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): Like my colleague the representative of India, we wish to express our sincerest condolences to you, Mr. Chair, and welcome you back to the First Committee.

My delegation voted in favour of operative paragraphs 2 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.30, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", as well as in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. As the Committee is aware, those who voted in favour of the draft resolution have shown respect for international law and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. In contrast, it is also clear to the Committee that the delegations of the United States and the Israeli entity, by abstaining in the voting on the draft resolution, have expressed their support for the practices of occupying others' territories, violating international law and rejecting compliance with any of the international resolutions on the illegality of occupying territories by force. Of course, in abstaining they have also isolated themselves.

As the First Committee is aware, the Israeli entity has occupied numerous Arab territories, including the Syrian Golan. In addition, United States forces are currently occupying territories in my country. The occupied territories in the Golan and those occupied by United States forces will sooner or later be returned to my country through the legitimate means afforded to us by international law and the United Nations Charter.

Since the unnatural birth of the Israeli entity in our region, terrorism has reached us in all its forms. Terrorist

gangs from all parts of the world have committed murders and massacres in occupied Palestine.

The Chair: I am sorry to interrupt the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, but this portion of the meeting is for statements in explanation of vote or position after adoption. This is not the time to state what is happening in certain countries and what the policies of other countries might be. I kindly ask the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to restrict his comments to explaining his delegation's own vote or position.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): It is my country's right to explain its vote in any way it sees fit. This is our right, which is guaranteed by the Committee's rules of procedure. Any country can explain its vote as it sees fit. I have not seen you, Mr. Chair, object to anyone in this way before. I will continue.

The ongoing terrorism of the Israeli entity committed in our region has been explicitly acknowledged by delegations voting in favour of paragraphs 2 and 5 and in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. As I said a moment ago, the two delegations that abstained in the voting have isolated themselves, given the arsenal of resolutions against the Israeli entity and the occupation. However, as a result of the voting a while ago, it has become clear who supports occupation and terrorism in our region and who does not.

The terrorism conducted by Israel in our region in all its forms is known to all. It has committed nuclear, chemical and biological terrorism, as well as espionage against its closest allies, or those that it claims are its allies. Nevertheless, such terrorism and occupation will soon end.

The Chair: I kindly request that the First Committee take note of the following. The Committee is in the hands of its members; it is their Committee, and the rules of procedure were created by them. All of us are sufficiently clever to find ways to abuse the rules of procedure, but doing so can never be in good faith.

Mr. Khaldi (Algeria) (*spoke in Arabic*): I wish to reiterate my delegation's expression of its sincerest condolences to you, Mr. Chair, for your loss.

My delegation would like to reaffirm Algeria's full commitment to working towards the achievement of disarmament objectives at the regional level, as doing so contributes to establishing the foundations of

security, peace and stability in the relevant regions. My delegation regrets that draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.30, which is submitted by my country every year, was adopted this year by a vote, whereas in previous years it was always adopted by consensus. The draft resolution is Algeria's contribution to strengthening security and cooperation in the Mediterranean, which is considered a vital region.

Paragraph 2 reaffirms the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which are respected by everyone. Paragraph 5 represents a call on all States of the region to accede to international instruments on disarmament — a call specifically directed at States that sincerely want to engage in collective disarmament efforts.

The Chair: I now call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a point of order.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): At the outset, Mr. Chair, I would like to express my condolences for your loss.

I take the floor on a point of order to ask a question. I fully agree with what the Chair said about not abusing the First Committee's rules of procedure. I also fully respect the powers of the Chair pursuant to the rules of procedure, and I fully respect the Chair's rulings that are based on the rules of procedure. However, this was the first time I ever saw the Chair of the Committee interrupt a representative speaking in explanation of vote and remind him that he was delivering a right of reply and should continue with an explanation of vote.

My question is therefore the following: Is there any provision in the rules of procedure that grants power to the Chair to judge whether a representative is delivering a right of reply or an explanation of vote? As far as I know, in the rules of procedure, explanations of vote should not be read from a written text, but delivered orally and off the cuff.

I would therefore appreciate it, Sir, if you could point out a specific rule that provided you with the basis for interrupting the Syrian representative when he was reading out his explanation of vote.

The Chair: I did not say that the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic was delivering a right of reply; those were the words of the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. I said only that the portion of the meeting where the representative of Syria took the floor was for statements in explanation of vote or

position, and that such explanations had to be delivered in good faith, as is the case with any part of a meeting's procedure. I did not say that someone had not been acting in good faith; rather, I said that the rules of procedure should be followed in good faith, which I presume every delegation is already doing.

If the 193 countries represented in this conference room were to request the floor in explanation of vote and each spoke for 10 minutes about the positions of other countries, that might be entirely permissible from a procedural point of view, but in the interests, let us say, of good faith and the good work of the Committee, we would need another five weeks to get that done.

What I said was not meant as a sign of disrespect to any delegation. I simply expressed a wish for delegations to respect the rules of procedure and all other delegations. Whenever a delegation asks for the floor, it is granted it. I do not know whether or not what I am saying is 100 per cent within the rules of procedure or not, but it is based on my good-will and good-faith understanding as Chair as I try to properly conduct the proceedings of the First Committee.

I now call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a further point of order.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I thank you for your explanation, Mr. Chair. I therefore understand that the interruption of the Syrian representative's explanation of vote was based not on the rules of procedure, but entirely on the subjective judgment of the Chair.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote or position after the adoption of the draft resolutions under cluster 6, "Regional disarmament and security".

The Committee has before it informal paper No. 3 and will now turn to cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". I shall first give the floor to those delegations that wish to make general statements or introduce draft resolutions or decisions. Delegations are reminded that general statements are limited to five minutes.

I wish to inform delegations that the main sponsor of the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/73/L.61 has decided to withdraw it.

I now give the floor to the representative of Peru to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.56.

Mr. Prieto (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): As it does every year, my delegation takes the floor to introduce, on behalf of the 33 States that make up the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.56, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean”.

This year my country was again called upon to facilitate the draft resolution on the Regional Centre, based in Lima, which refers to its activities for the period from July 2017 to June 2018. In that regard, the draft resolution highlights the Regional Centre’s important role and the support it provides to States in the region in advancing a series of initiatives and activities aimed at implementing peace and disarmament measures, as well as promoting their economic and social development through the appropriate use of available resources.

Finally, my delegation would like to thank the Member States and other partners that have supported the Centre’s operations and programmes through their contributions, both financial and in kind, and we call on all countries to continue making their generous contributions. We also reiterate our firm support for the role of the Centre as a promoter of the activities of the United Nations at the regional level to strengthen peace, stability, security and development. That is why we trust that we can count on the invaluable support of all delegations to ensure that the draft resolution is adopted by consensus, as in previous years.

Ms. Castro Loredo (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, we convey to you, Sir, our sincerest condolences.

Cuba wishes to make a general statement with regard to draft resolutions under cluster 7. Our country recognizes and defends the central role of the United Nations, in particular its disarmament machinery, which was established by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, with the consensus of all Member States.

We reiterate the importance of the Conference on Disarmament agreeing on a broad and balanced programme of work without further delay that will enable the body to overcome its two-decade stalemate and take forward negotiations on various issues on its agenda, in fulfilment of its mandate. The Conference on Disarmament is able to negotiate various items on its agenda simultaneously if there is a prevailing will from all. The lack of political will of some of its member States that seek to maintain the status quo, especially

in the area of nuclear disarmament, is the cause for the stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament. We reject the politicization of the work of the Conference, and we call on States to respect its agreed working methods and rules of procedure.

Cuba acknowledges the recent decision of the Conference on Disarmament to establish five subsidiary bodies on agenda items for the 2018 session, and it warmly welcomes the adoption by the Conference of the substantive reports of those subsidiary bodies, which form a basis for the substantive work of the Conference of Disarmament in 2019. The consultations on various agenda items, held in the intersessional period, are also a positive step.

Furthermore, Cuba warmly welcomes the beginning of deliberations and the establishment of a working group in the Disarmament Commission on transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities, with a view to preventing an arms race in outer space. We encourage the Disarmament Commission to ensure that, during this cycle, it is able to issue recommendations on the two items on its agenda, especially with regard to nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. Cuba reiterates the importance of continuing consultations among Member States on the next steps for convening the fourth special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, which could contribute to overcoming the stalemate of the disarmament machinery and mobilizing the priority objective of nuclear disarmament.

We welcome the work of the three United Nations Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament and the ongoing support that they have provided for Member States over the past 30 years through implementing disarmament, arms-control and non-proliferation activities. In particular, we back the role of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean. We highlight the work that it has carried out for years in promoting the three areas of its mandate, namely, disarmament, development and peace. In the same vein, we recognize that many States of the region have indeed benefited from the assistance provided by the Centre. We also wish to acknowledge the work of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.

As part of its commitment to the disarmament machinery, the Cuban delegation will endorse the adoption of all draft resolutions under this cluster.

We emphasize the need to ensure ongoing support for multilateralism, which is a basic principle for disarmament, non-proliferation and arms-control negotiations against a backdrop of constant threats. We are deeply concerned by the unilateral measures taken by specific States under the pretext of security issues, which have withdrawn from disarmament and arms-control instruments, endangering international security and undermining confidence in the international system and the credibility of the disarmament machinery. These attempts to impose domestic policies, while ignoring previously agreed commitments and international obligations, jeopardize the credibility of the disarmament machinery.

Mr. Kafle (Nepal): Mr. Chair, allow me to express my delegation's sincere condolences to you for your loss.

Nepal has been a strong advocate of the important role of regional disarmament in maintaining international peace and security. We are of the view that the regional and global approaches to disarmament and non-proliferation complement one another and should therefore be pursued simultaneously. Regional dialogues and exchanges of views held build confidence and create an environment conducive to making further progress in regional peace and disarmament. In this regard, we appreciate the activities of the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific (UNRCPD) aimed at promoting regional discussions on important disarmament agenda issues through the Kathmandu process. As the host country of the Regional Centre, Nepal is committed to lending its full support to the UNRCPD's playing an enhanced and constructive role.

On behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution's sponsors, my delegation has the honour to introduce, draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.38, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific" in the First Committee. The sponsors of the draft resolution are Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, India, Japan, Maldives, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, New Zealand, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Viet Nam and my own country, Nepal. My delegation expresses its sincere gratitude to all the sponsors for their valuable support. We are confident that, as in previous years, we will have the valuable support of all delegations for the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.

Mr. Riquet (France) (*spoke in French*): I take the floor to state that France has regretfully decided to withdraw draft decision A/C.1/73/L.61, "Thirty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research", and will therefore not be submitting the draft text for adoption.

As we have said before, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) plays a special role within the disarmament machinery. As one of UNIDIR's founding members, France attaches particular importance to the Institute, and periodically submits a draft resolution reaffirming the unanimous support of the international community for it.

The year 2015, which marked the Institute's thirty-fifth anniversary, was characterized by a number of institutional, organizational and financial challenges. It was against this backdrop that resolution 70/69 was adopted to support UNIDIR during this delicate period and prepare the Institute for the future. The implementation of the resolution provided for, in particular, an external audit to sketch out new rigorous management and financing models, which would have allowed the Institute to establish in future a more solid and lasting foundation. This audit was the subject of a report of the Secretary-General, contained in document A/73/284, which was submitted to the First Committee. In this context, this year, France submitted draft decision A/C.1/73/L.61, which took note of the report, renewed support for the Institute and simply inscribed the issue on the agenda of the next session of the General Assembly.

The draft decision, which was based on language previously agreed by the General Assembly and of a simple procedural nature, was, very unfortunately, subjected to a recorded vote and the threat of a negative vote. We can only regret that decision. France finds it inconceivable that a draft resolution on an institution that is part of the disarmament machinery would not be adopted by consensus.

In that context, as I stated, we have made the decision to withdraw the text this year with great regret. Nonetheless, in line with that decision, we truly hope that during the First Committee's seventy-fourth session next year, the future of the Institute can be discussed, and we also hope that consensus can be achieved on the topic. I wish to assure all those delegations that undoubtedly share our frustration

with this year's deplorable situation of France's full commitment to the matter.

Mr. Gallhofer (Austria): Allow me to also express my condolences.

I am taking the floor on behalf of Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Benin, Brazil, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates and my own country, Austria.

We would have supported draft decision A/C.1/73/L.61, "Thirty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research". We welcome the appreciation of the work of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) in the withdrawn draft decision, as well as the acknowledgement of the Institute as a stand-alone, autonomous institution. Our support for the withdrawn draft decision should also be seen in the light of our strong support for the proposed sustainable and stable funding structure and operating model, outlined in report A/73/256.

The independence and credibility of UNIDIR are vital for fulfilling the Institute's important mandate, including, *inter alia*, providing the international community with more diversified and complete data on problems relating to international security, the armament race and disarmament in all fields; promoting the informed participation of delegations in disarmament forums; assisting in ongoing negotiations on disarmament; and carrying out more in-depth, forward-looking and long-term research on disarmament.

To deliver on its mandate, sound and predictable finances are essential. Currently, only 9 per cent of UNIDIR's budget is covered by the United Nations regular budget. To safeguard its credibility and independence, a careful balance between regular budget and voluntary, often project-based funding needs to be struck. We therefore reiterate our support for the

report's recommendations for a modest increase in the contributions from the United Nations regular budget to the Institute. We look forward to working together with others to achieve that through future decisions on UNIDIR.

Mr. Horne (Australia): Allow us to also join others in expressing our condolences to you, Sir, and welcoming you back among us here.

I am taking the floor to briefly add to the statement from the representative of Austria on the draft decision regarding the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) that has just been withdrawn. We share the views expressed that it is regrettable that the draft decision has been withdrawn at the last moment, and we agree that, for a draft decision like this, consensus is the ideal outcome. I would just reiterate Australia's support for the recommendations in the Secretary-General's report (A/73/284) and emphasize the importance of an adequately resourced UNIDIR.

The Chair: The Committee will proceed to take action on draft proposals under cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

The Committee will first proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.16, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.16 was submitted by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, on 8 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.16.

The main sponsors have informed us of the following oral revision to the seventh preambular paragraph of the text, which reads as follows:

"Recalling the conclusion of the work of the Open-ended Working Group on the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament to consider the objectives and agenda of the fourth special session, and to adopt its report and substantive recommendations by consensus".

The main sponsors have informed us of the following oral revision to the eighth preambular paragraph of the text, which reads as follows:

“Recalling also the report of the Open-ended Working Group and the recommendations contained therein”.

The main sponsors have informed us of the following oral revision to operative paragraph 1 of the text, which reads as follows:

“Recalls the adoption by consensus of the recommendations on the objectives and agenda of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament by the Open-ended Working Group on the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which was established by the Assembly by its resolution 65/66 and its decision 70/551 and which met in New York in 2016 and 2017”.

The main sponsors have informed us of the following oral revision to operative paragraph 2 of the text, which reads as follows:

“Recalls also the report of the Open-ended Working Group and the substantive recommendations contained therein”.

The main sponsors have informed us of the following oral revision to operative paragraph 3 of the text, which reads as follows:

“Reiterates its appreciation to the participants of the Open-ended Working Group for their constructive contribution to its work”.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

France, Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.16, as orally revised, was adopted by 174 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.18, entitled “United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.18 was submitted by the

representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, on 8 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.18

The main sponsors have informed us of the following oral revision to the fifth preambular paragraph of the text, which now reads as follows:

“Recalling that the thirtieth anniversary of the establishment by the General Assembly of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific, and the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean was celebrated in 2016 and in 2017”.

The main sponsors have informed us of the following oral revision to operative paragraph 2 of the text, which now reads as follows:

“Commends the three regional centres for peace and disarmament for their sustained support provided to Member States for over 30 years in implementing disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation activities”.

I shall now read out an oral statement by the Secretariat with regard to the draft resolution. The present statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.18, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide all support necessary, within existing resources, to the regional centres in carrying out their programme of activities. The implementation of the request contained in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019. The provisions contained therein would cover 10 posts: three P-5 senior political affairs officers; three P-3 political affairs officers; and four General Service/local-level posts for the regional centres, as well as the general operating expenses of the centres. The programme of activities of the three regional centres would also continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.18, no additional requirements

would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 72/261, of 24 December 2017, in which the Assembly reaffirms that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirms the role of the Fifth Committee in carrying out a thorough analysis and approving human and financial resources and policies with the view to ensuring the full, effective and efficient implementation of all mandated programmes and activities and the implementation of policies in that regard.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.18 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.34, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.34 was submitted by the representative of Nigeria, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.34. The additional sponsor is Equatorial Guinea.

I shall now read an oral statement by the Secretariat with regard to the draft resolution. The present statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 4 and 11 of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.34, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to facilitate close cooperation between the Regional Centre and the African Union, in particular in the areas of disarmament, peace and security; and request the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Regional Centre with the support necessary for greater

achievements and results. The implementation of the requests contained in paragraphs 4 and 11 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, “Disarmament”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019, which would cover one P-5 senior political affairs officer, one P-3 political affairs officer and two General Service/local-level posts, as well as general operating expenses. The programme of activities of the Regional Centre would also continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.34, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section 6 of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 70/261, of 24 December 2017, in which the Assembly reaffirms that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirms the role of the Fifth Committee in carrying out a thorough analysis and approving human and financial resources and policies, with a view to ensuring the full, effective and efficient implementation of all mandated programmes and activities and the implementation of policies in that regard.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.34 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.34 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.36, entitled “Report of the Disarmament Commission”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.36 was submitted by the representative of Australia on 15 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/73/L.36.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.36 has expressed the wish that it be

adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.36 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.38, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.38 was submitted by the representative of Nepal on 15 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.38. The additional sponsor is Indonesia.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.38 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.38 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.40, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.40 was submitted by the representative of Turkey on 16 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/73/L.40.

I shall now read out an oral statement by the Secretariat with regard to the draft resolution. The present statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.40, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to ensure and to strengthen, if needed, the provision to the Conference on Disarmament of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services. It is recalled that the resources for the substantive and Secretariat support of the Conference on Disarmament are included under section 4, “Disarmament”, and that the resources for conference servicing are included

under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management”, of the programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

Subject to decisions taken at the 2019 session of the Conference on Disarmament to establish its programme of work for 2019 and/or to establish any subsidiary bodies, the strengthening of all necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services to the Conference, as requested in paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, may entail additional resource requirements under the programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019. The established procedures would be followed, as necessary, in the context of actions taken by the Conference on Disarmament. At this time, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.40 would not give rise to any programme budget implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.40 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.40 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.56, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.56 was submitted by the representative of Peru, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.56.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.56 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.56 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.69/Rev.1,

entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”.

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.69/Rev.1 was submitted by the representatives of Congo and Cameroon, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Economic Community of Central African States, on 23 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.69/Rev.1. The additional sponsor is Equatorial Guinea.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.69/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.69/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to make statements in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

I give the floor to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of my country associates itself with the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.40, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”, because my country, Syria, believes in real and sincere multilateralism at all levels, including disarmament. My country is also convinced of the importance of the Conference on Disarmament, as it is the only multilateral forum for negotiation on disarmament that is able to achieve the objective of nuclear disarmament and a world free of nuclear weapons.

During its presidency of the Conference my country was keen to create a comprehensive and balanced programme of work that would address the concerns of Member States based on the rules of procedure. The Syrian presidency was the only one to present a draft programme of work for the Conference in 2018. The draft programme of work was broadly supported by Member States. However, the politicization by the United States and its allies made it impossible to agree on a programme of work, which was the result of excuses that had nothing to do with the Conference’s

agenda. Hence, everybody knows that, as a result of the positions of certain countries, a procedural report was adopted instead of a substantive one.

In breach of working methods and practices at the Conference level, the secretariat of the Conference on Disarmament published a memorandum on the Conference website dated 11 October, in an unprofessional manner, under the symbol CD/2147. That memorandum, submitted by France on behalf of Britain and the United States, contains false accusations against my country. Ironically, the document was not circulated to all Member States of the Conference, and the country concerned did not have an opportunity to clarify its position on it.

With that in mind, my country's delegation expresses its reservation concerning the reference to that document in the annex and considers that it is not included in the procedural report of the Conference on Disarmament.

The Chair: We have heard from the only speaker in explanation of vote or position after the adoption of proposals under cluster 7.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on the remaining draft proposals under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons". I shall first give the floor to those delegations that wish to explain their votes or positions before we take action on the remaining proposals.

I give the floor to the representative of Morocco.

Ms. Abbar (Morocco): My delegation joins others in expressing its heartfelt condolences for your loss, Sir.

Morocco fully subscribes to the goal of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and of a nuclear-weapon-free world. Morocco therefore intends to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.66, with the understanding that participation in the fourth Conference of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones is open only to United Nations States Members and observer States, as clearly specified in paragraph 2, and that preparatory meetings and formal consultations leading to the preparations for the Conference, its rules of procedure and draft outcome document are to be conducted in full respect for paragraph 2.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons".

The Committee will first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.66, entitled "Fourth Conference of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia, 2020".

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

Mr. Lomaia (Deputy Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.66 was submitted by the representatives of Brazil and Mongolia on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/73/L.66.

The main sponsors have informed us of the following oral revision to the text. A new eighth preambular paragraph has been added, which reads as follows:

"Taking note of paragraph 232 of the Final Document of the Eighteenth Midterm Ministerial Meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Baku from 3 to 6 April 2018, in which the Ministers stated their belief that those nuclear-weapon-free zones were positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation".

The main sponsors have informed us that an oral revision was made to paragraph 7 of the text, which now reads as follows:

"Welcomes the offer by Mongolia to act as coordinator of the fourth Conference and to conduct preparatory meetings and informal consultations, including with relevant regional organizations, as may be necessary to prepare for the Conference and its rules of procedure and draft outcome document, beginning in early 2019".

The additional sponsor is Jamaica.

I shall now read out an oral statement by the Secretariat with regard to the draft resolution. The present statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 1 and 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.66, the General Assembly would decide to convene the fourth Conference of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia as a one-day conference at Headquarters on 24 April 2020, and request the Secretary-General to provide the support necessary to convene the fourth Conference of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia and to transmit the

report of the fourth Conference to the Conference on Disarmament and the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Pursuant to the request in paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, it is the understanding of the Secretary-General that conference services would be required for the fourth Conference of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia, to be held in 2020. Conference services for two meetings with interpretation and documentation services are estimated at \$54,500. In addition, it is estimated that an amount of \$19,700 would be required to cover non-conference service requirements, including information and communications technology services, security services, miscellaneous services and administrative costs and other support services. All costs related to the fourth Conference of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia shall be met in accordance with the arrangements to be made by the States parties to the treaties.

In that regard, the request in paragraph 8 would not have financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations. It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties that, under their respective legal arrangements, are to be financed outside of the regular budget of the United Nations may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.66, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019, as well as in the proposed programme budget for 2020.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.66, as orally revised, was adopted by 171 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to make statements in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. Khaldi (Algeria) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to explain Algeria's voting on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.66, entitled "Fourth Conference of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia, 2020".

Algeria voted in favour of the draft resolution because we are convinced of the importance of those zones and their significant contribution to nuclear disarmament efforts. On the other hand, we believe that the Conference, like preceding ones, must ensure the participation of all parties to the treaties that establish nuclear-weapon-free zones, as well as Mongolia, without any exclusion.

Mr. Hassan (Egypt): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.66, entitled "Fourth Conference of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia, 2020".

Egypt voted in favour of the draft resolution, in line with its principled position regarding the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons and the role of nuclear-weapon-free zones in achieving that goal. In its second preambular paragraph, the draft resolution clearly recognizes the right of any group of States to conclude regional treaties, and in its seventh preambular paragraph it urges States that have not yet established such zones to accelerate their efforts in that direction, according to agreements freely arrived at. Obviously, such agreements cannot be freely arrived at without negotiations.

In that connection, we would like to register our strong disagreement with the counterproductive interpretation of the United Nations Disarmament Commission's 1999 guidelines expressed during this session of the First Committee by some delegations that have argued that, if a conference is to be convened to negotiate such an agreement, all the States concerned must approve. We wish to draw the attention of those delegations to the fact that this argument carries multiple negative implications. For example, the argument truly jeopardizes the very foundation upon which the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW) is based. The TPNW is a treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free world that was adopted by a vote at a conference that was boycotted by all the nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-umbrella States, among others. We strongly advise against arguments that would undermine the Treaty, which we strongly stood by and contributed to, despite all the pressure and counter-démarches. We urge those delegations to reconsider their positions on this matter and, on our part, we will continue to pursue the cause of nuclear disarmament at both the global and the regional levels.

Mr. Cleobury (United Kingdom): I am speaking on behalf of France, the United States and my own country, the United Kingdom, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.66, "Fourth Conference of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia, 2020".

We would like to emphasize the importance that we attach to the development, where appropriate, of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones. Such zones can be an important contribution to regional and global security, provided that they are established as set out in the 1999 guidelines of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. In particular, they must be freely arrived at by all States of the region concerned, verified, *inter alia*, through comprehensive safeguards applied by the International Atomic Energy Agency and concluded in consultation with the nuclear-weapon States.

We would like to make it clear that we cannot endorse the language in the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution that refers to freeing the southern hemisphere and adjacent areas from nuclear weapons. We continue to believe that it is contradictory to propose the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone that would be composed largely of the high seas, while simultaneously claiming that it would be fully consistent with applicable principles and rules of international law, including the navigational rights and freedoms provided for in the international law of the sea, as reflected in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, such as the freedoms of navigation and overflight and other internationally lawful uses of the sea related to those freedoms.

We would like to thank the Secretariat for its oral statement clarifying that the costs related to the fourth Conference of States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia shall be met in accordance with the arrangements made by the States parties to the treaties and would not have financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations.

I would now like to make another explanation of vote on a draft resolution under cluster 1. I am speaking on behalf of the United Kingdom, the United States and France with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.52, "Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems".

We continue to disagree with the premise that the nuclear-weapons States' current level of readiness of nuclear weapons automatically increases the risk of unintentional or accidental use and that lowered alert levels will in all cases lead to heightened international security. While alert levels can and have been lowered in response to an improved internationally security climate, the relationship between alert levels and security is complex. We would like to restate that the operational readiness of our respective nuclear-weapons systems is maintained at a level consonant with our national security requirements and our obligations to our allies, within the larger context of the current global strategic situation. In reflection thereof, we have decreased the operational readiness and alert levels of our respective forces since the early 1990s. Additionally, our respective nuclear-weapons systems are no longer targeted against any State.

We would also like to reiterate that our nuclear-weapons systems are subject to the most rigorous command, control and communications systems so as to ensure against the possibility of accidental or unintentional use, to guarantee that such weapons could only be used at the sole direction of the proper national command authority and to maximize that authority's decision time.

Mr. Lynch (New Zealand): Allow me to join others in expressing my delegation's condolences to you, Sir.

I am taking the floor regarding draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.66, on which New Zealand voted in favour. We very clearly recall the difficulties that arose in connection with the convening of the third Conference of States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia in 2015, and we can understand the desire of the sponsors to have important procedural issues for the fourth Conference resolved in a timely fashion.

However, the language that the sponsors have put forward in paragraph 2 to establish relevant participation rights would have the unfortunate result of precluding two States from taking part in the Conference, namely, Niue and the Cook Islands, which are parties to the South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone, established by the Treaty of Rarotonga.

New Zealand would wish the sponsors to take note of our concerns and to look to resolve them during the process for the adoption of the Conference's rules of

procedure. In any event, we state for the record our position that paragraph 2 is not to be taken as the basis for a precedent applicable in the future.

Ms. Castro Loredo (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/73/L.66, "Fourth Conference of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia, 2020".

The Cuban delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution, in view of its commitment to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and the objective of achieving a world free of nuclear weapons. However, the Cuban delegation did not sponsor the draft resolution this year, based on its belief that the text has been weakened by changes regarding resolutions 64/52 and 69/66, adopted by the General Assembly in 2009 and 2014, respectively.

We regret the removal of language referring to the proclamation of Latin America and the Caribbean as a zone of peace, as signed by the Heads of State and Government at the second Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, held in Havana in 2014. We reiterate that the tenets of that proclamation remain valid and must be respected.

We take note that the draft resolution directly invites only Member States and observer States of the United Nations that are States parties or signatories to the treaties that establish nuclear-weapon-free zones and Mongolia to participate in the fourth Conference of States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia. We also note that States parties and signatories of protocols to the treaties that establish nuclear-weapon-free zones and all remaining Member States and observer States of the United Nations are invited to participate as observers.

In the light of the fact that not all States parties and signatories to the treaties that establish nuclear-weapon-free zones to the Conference are invited, we call on the Conference to reach an agreement during its preparatory process, in particular its adoption of the rules of procedure, that is satisfactory for all parties and allows all States parties and signatories of the aforementioned treaties to participate in the Conference, without exclusion and on equal terms.

We encourage Mongolia to act as a coordinator of the fourth Conference and to convene preparatory

meetings and informal consultations, as well as to make every effort in that regard to achieve an agreement on the pending issues that would allow all States parties and signatories of the aforementioned treaties to participate in the Conference on equal terms.

The Chair: A basic principle of law is that legal texts have to be applied in letter and spirit. That same principle applies to the rules of procedure, which I know everyone in this room wholly supports.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.