



General Assembly

Seventy-fifth session

First Committee

15th meeting

Tuesday, 10 November 2020, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Santos Maraver(Spain)

The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m.

Agenda items 94 to 110 (continued)

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

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): This morning the Committee will continue to take action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under agenda items 94 to 110. Thereafter we will consider the draft provisional programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2021, as contained in document A/C.1/75/CRP.5.

At its meeting yesterday (see A/C.1/75/PV.14), the Committee took up cluster 6, “Regional disarmament and security”, as contained in document A/C.1/75/INF/2/Rev.3, and heard general statements. In the absence of any requests from delegations wishing to explain their position, the Committee will now move to taking action on those drafts.

(*spoke in English*)

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.9, entitled “Maintenance of international security — good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.9 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of North Macedonia. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/75/L.9.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.9 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.23, entitled “Regional disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.23 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Pakistan. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.23.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.23 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.24, entitled “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.24 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Pakistan. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.24.

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>).

20-30436 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



The Chair: Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.24.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, 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, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia

Against:

India, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

None

The seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.24 was retained by 147 votes to 2.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Bangladesh, Haiti, Madagascar, Sri Lanka, Uruguay and Yemen informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France,

Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.24 was retained by 99 votes to 1, with 49 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Haiti, Madagascar, Sri Lanka, Uruguay and Yemen informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.24, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, 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, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New

Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, 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, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.24, as a whole, was adopted by 159 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Haiti, Madagascar, Sri Lanka, Uruguay and Yemen informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.25, entitled "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.25 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Pakistan. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.25.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.25 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.31, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.31 was submitted on 7 October by the representative of Algeria. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.31.

The Chair: Separate, recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 2 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.31.

I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, 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, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela

(Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.31 was retained by 154 votes to 2.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Haiti, Madagascar and Sri Lanka informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, 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, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao

Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.31 was retained by 155 votes to 2.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Haiti, Madagascar and Sri Lanka informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.31, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, 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, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco,

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.31, as a whole, was adopted by 160 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Haiti, Madagascar and Sri Lanka informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on delegations wishing to explain their vote or position after the voting.

Mr. Balouji (Iran): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.31, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

Iran voted in favour of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which calls for the elimination of all causes of tension in the region and for the promotion of just and lasting solutions to its persistent problems. More importantly, our support for this paragraph is based on its call for ensuring the withdrawal of foreign forces of occupation while respecting the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all countries of the region, including full adherence to the principles of non-use or threat of use of force and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, as well as the

right of their peoples to self-determination. These are basic principles of international law and enjoy our strong support.

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

However, my delegation did not participate in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole, as it does not reflect the factual realities in the region or the situation in the occupied territories, including the continued killing of innocent civilians in the occupied territories of Palestine and the Israeli regime's extraordinarily severe blockade of the Gaza Strip.

Mr. Asokan (India): India voted against A/C.1/75/L.24, on conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels, as well as its operative paragraph 2, which requests the Conference on Disarmament to consider formulating principles to serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control.

As the world's single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, the vocation of the Conference on Disarmament is to negotiate disarmament instruments of global application. The Disarmament Commission adopted by consensus guidelines and recommendations on regional disarmament 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 the security concerns of States extend beyond narrowly defined regions. Consequently, the notion of preserving a balance in defence capabilities in the regional or subregional context is both unrealistic and unacceptable. We are therefore unconvinced that conventional arms control, which is a global issue, should be pursued primarily in a regional or subregional context. For that reason, India also voted against the seventh preambular paragraph.

Mr. Mohd Nasir (Malaysia): Guided by its principled positions on regional disarmament and security, Malaysia joined consensus and voted in favour

of all the draft resolutions, as well as their separate paragraphs, under cluster 6, "Regional disarmament and security". Malaysia views the nuclear-weapon-free zones established pursuant to their respective treaties as vitally important to enhancing global and regional peace. These instruments strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime and contribute to realizing the objectives of nuclear disarmament.

As a founding member of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and a party to the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty, Malaysia reaffirms the significance of such zones and treaties in the pursuit of a nuclear-weapon-free world. We underscore the importance of realizing the overarching objectives of the Treaty and its Protocol in accordance with the ASEAN 2025: Forging Ahead Together declaration, adopted by ASEAN's leaders at the twenty-seventh ASEAN Summit in 2015. It is imperative that the nuclear-weapon States accede to the Protocol. Malaysia welcomes the consultation and continuing dialogue between ASEAN and the nuclear-weapon States aimed at resolving protracted issues so that they can sign and ratify the Protocol as soon as possible. We also reaffirm our commitment to continuing to work with the ASEAN member States in active pursuit of that goal and to maintaining the international profile of the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty by submitting the biennial resolution on it to the First Committee at the seventy-sixth session of the General Assembly in 2021, following the last substantive submission, in 2015.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard from the last speaker in explanation of vote on cluster 6, "Regional disarmament and security".

The Committee will now turn to cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". I shall first give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or introduce draft resolutions or decisions under cluster 7. Delegations are reminded that general statements are limited to three minutes. Once again, I appeal to delegations to consider submitting a written statement.

I now give the floor to the representative of France to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.37.

Mr. Le Floc'h (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to make a general statement on behalf of Germany and France in introducing draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.37, entitled "Fortieth anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research"

, which our countries are jointly sponsoring at the seventy-fifth session of the General Assembly. France, because of its historic role in the creation of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), and Germany, as its largest donor, have a special relationship with the Institute. The five-year resolution on UNIDIR aims to reaffirm the support of the international community for the Institute's work and activities. France and Germany have always been and will continue to be strong supporters of UNIDIR, both in the use of its excellent work and in the funding of the Institute's events and research activities.

This year is particularly important, as it marks UNIDIR's fortieth anniversary. It is a time to reflect on past successes and to put the Institute on a sustainable financial footing so that it can continue to fully meet its mandate. The portion of the regular United Nations budget allocated to UNIDIR has not increased since 2000. At the same time, in response to the needs of the international community and the challenges posed by the growing diversity of security and disarmament issues, UNIDIR has increased its activities and publications, resulting in increased expenditure. Besides that, some unplanned expenses have arisen this year, such as the introduction of rent by the United Nations Office at Geneva and costs related to the coronavirus disease health crisis. Successive reports of the Secretary-General and that of the UNIDIR Board of Trustees (A/75/134), as well as the report of the external audit conducted in 2018, have all concluded that the subsidy from the regular United Nations budget should be increased. Such a reassessment is essential if we are to strengthen the Institute's impartiality, independence and sustainability over the long term and support the core of its mandate.

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.37 proposes to take the necessary action. We regret that a vote has been requested on the resolution this year, in a historic break with consensus on this resolution, which relates to a key component of the disarmament machinery. Nevertheless, we look forward to the broadest possible support from Member States.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation to introduce draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We believe that the United Nations and its multilateral disarmament machinery plays a central

role in addressing issues related to disarmament, non-proliferation and international security, as envisaged by its founding fathers, 75 years ago. Each of the components of the disarmament triad — the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament — has vital significance for the international discussions on these matters.

We regret that the work of a fundamental pillar of the disarmament mechanism, the Disarmament Commission, has now been blocked for two years, practically speaking. The reason for that is Washington's continuing policy of seeking to politicize the activity of the disarmament platforms in New York and its efforts to put pressure on delegations that are inconvenient for it with crude procedural methods instead of conducting substantive discussion. For the past year Washington has been denying visas to leading experts in this field from Russia and the delegations of a number of other countries, in gross violation of the 1947 Headquarters Agreement and disregard for key provisions of General Assembly resolution 74/195. But that is merely the legalistic side of the matter. Politically speaking, these are petty and ultimately unimpressive games, unworthy of a great Power. Is the prospect of a visit by our experts really so frightening to Washington that it is prepared to lose face year after year in the First Committee simply in order to avoid admitting them?

We urge our American colleagues to return to a normal pattern of respectful dialogue and cooperation between States, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Headquarters Agreement. Suggestions that this issue should be discussed only in the Committee on Relations with the Host Country are groundless. The United States torpedoes any substantive discussion there too. Our American colleagues have no grounds and certainly no legal right to block representatives of Member States from participating in United Nations events or decide who should be on their staff, let alone head national delegations. The Americans' destructive actions are undermining the authority of the Secretariat and the Secretary-General personally, obliged as they are to resolve all organizational issues in ensuring the normal functioning of United Nations organs regardless of the country in which a specific event takes place.

Russia has a greater interest than anyone in restoring the disarmament machinery's normal functioning. Guided by these considerations, we have proposed for the First Committee's consideration

draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, entitled “2021 session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission”. We would like to point out that it is a very constructive text, aimed exclusively at injecting momentum into the work of the Commission and based entirely on the non-confrontational consensus language of last year’s decision on the Commission and consensus resolution 74/195. Our draft reproduces almost in its entirety last year’s decision, submitted by Australia and Hungary. However, it differs from Australia’s current draft in reflecting all substantive provisions concerning the prospects for the work of the Commission in the upcoming period.

As for the addendums to the draft, they are entirely based on United Nations resolutions that are directly related to the work of the Disarmament Commission. The issue of ensuring all delegations’ full participation in the work of the Commission is more than one of legitimacy, and it is about substance rather than procedure. Until it is resolved, we intend to raise all the organizational aspects, including that of visas, at every level available to us, as issues that have a direct bearing on the work of the Disarmament Commission. Without this, none of the so-called technical decisions such as Australia’s proposal make any sense. That is our principled position.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Belarus to introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.7 and A/C.1/75/L.51.

Mr. Tozik (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): Belarus would like to present for the First Committee’s consideration draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.7, entitled “Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

The content of the draft resolution has remained the same and does not differ substantively from resolution 72/23, its predecessor, adopted in 2017. The draft is designed to improve internationally agreed procedures that enable us to monitor the potential development of new weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and that should help to formulate specific recommendations on new types of such weapons. The draft is preventive in nature, as we believe that preventive measures are the best way of combating potential threats to international peace and security. It represents a barrier to anyone who might be working on new types of WMD. In a certain

sense, it complements Security Council resolution 1540 (2004), aimed at combating the proliferation of WMDs and preventing them from falling into the wrong hands, and we call on all States to support it.

This year we also authored draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.51, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”, whose purpose is to assess the efforts of the Conference in 2020 and make recommendations for its work in 2021. We affirm the Conference’s unique role as a multilateral platform for negotiating disarmament and international security issues. We have a positive view of the Conference’s activities in 2020, including in the high-level segment. We hope to see the deadlock in the substantive work of the Conference end as soon as possible, a situation that has taken on particular significance in the light of the current deterioration in the international security architecture. The Conference examines initiatives that could make a positive contribution to reducing tensions, slowing the arms race and preventing the proliferation of dangerous technologies among non-State actors.

The draft resolution includes strengthened recommendations to the Presidency of the Conference aimed at overcoming the current impasse, and proposes keeping this traditional item on the General Assembly’s agenda. We urge States to support it.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Australia to introduce draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49.

Mr. Horne (Australia): It is good to see everyone back in one room again. I have missed that the last few days.

I am taking the floor to introduce draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49, which Australia has submitted for the third year in a row. The reason for that, as is well known, is that the Disarmament Commission has been blocked for various reasons and Australia is its most recently elected Chair, having served in 2018. The draft is a very clear, straightforward technical decision that provides the absolute basics for what the Disarmament Commission would require in order to meet next year. Delegations have also received an aide-memoire explaining how that would happen, and we hope to count on their support.

I should also note that there has again been a hostile challenge, for which we have already heard the reasons, to this technical decision submitted by the

Disarmament Commission Chair. We know that there is an outstanding issue. Most of us probably feel that we are now experts on the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, but we most certainly are not. Those are issues outside the remit of the First Committee and beyond its competence. It is unfortunate that this continues to block our work. I think it is probably fairly clear and well known that we have tried everything we possibly could over the past few years to unblock this process. We have looked through all sorts of substantive, bilateral and procedural options to move this item forward. Unfortunately, we remain stuck. There appears to still be an effort by some to weaponize consensus against the disarmament machinery.

It is regrettable that we find ourselves in this situation. We will continue to appeal to the good faith of all members and put our faith in the membership. We will let our better angels prevail and hope to count on members' support for our draft decision. We encourage others to think very carefully about their position on the Russian Federation's draft decision (A/C.1/75/L.48) and the amendments introduced, which are designed purely to continue to block our process.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now hear delegations in explanation of vote or position before taking action on the draft resolutions and decisions under cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

Mr. Knight (United States of America): The United States will vote no on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, entitled "2021 session of the Disarmament Commission". We will also vote no on all the separate votes called for on paragraphs in what is a typical effort to foul the process and the kind of procedural manoeuvre that we have come to expect from the Russian Federation. It is entirely inappropriate for Russia to raise its visa issues in the First Committee, as it well knows that the proper place to discuss that issue is in the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. We will also vote no on Russia's hostile amendments, contained in draft document A/C.1/75/L.79, to Australia's legitimate draft procedural decision A/C.1/75/L.49, on the Disarmament Commission. We urge all delegations to do the same.

Just recently, Russia joined a consensus on recommendations adopted by the Committee on Relations with the Host Country regarding visa issues. So that matter is already being addressed in the body that has jurisdiction. It does not belong here, and the First Committee should not adopt any draft resolution

or decision on visas. The injection of this non-germane matter into the work of the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission is an unhelpful distraction from and dilution of the disarmament discourse in both of those bodies, where we need more focus and time to address the disarmament challenges before us. That is especially true for the Disarmament Commission, whose work has been particularly impeded for reasons completely unrelated to its consensus-based agenda, which this year include the effects of the coronavirus disease pandemic. The Disarmament Commission is unfortunately ailing as a result.

Russia's draft procedural decision A/C.1/75/L.48 preys on this important body even further and will not make it any healthier moving forward. By contrast, Australia, the last duly elected Chair of the Commission, has rightfully introduced draft procedural decision A/C.1/75/L.49. Unlike Russia's, Australia's draft decision shepherds the Disarmament Commission forward in a clear and straightforward way and tries to give the Commission a chance to get back to work next year, unburdened with baggage that it has neither the remit nor the remedy to resolve. To make matters worse, Russia has now decided at the eleventh hour to attack and undermine the regular order even further by introducing A/C.1/75/L.79, containing its hostile amendments to Australia's draft decision. As with draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, its goal is to grind a political axe and hold the Disarmament Commission hostage in the process. Neither measure has anything to do with disarmament, about which Russia cares not at all, as its nuclear build-up and record of non-compliance demonstrate.

To be clear, the visa issue is important, which is why it is being appropriately addressed in the appropriate venue. Let us support Australia's draft decision instead of Russia's. Let us reject Russia's hostile amendments as well. Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49 represents a reasonable, responsible way forward for all Member States that continue to value the integrity of the existing United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery. By contrast, draft documents A/C.1/75/L.48 and A/C.1/75/L.79 do not. We urge all delegations to vote against both of those drafts as a whole, as well as on any associated paragraph votes.

Mrs. Jakob (Germany): I once again have the honour to speak on behalf of the member States of the European Union. The candidate countries North Macedonia, Montenegro and Albania, as well as

Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia, align themselves with this explanation of vote.

We are not in a position to support draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, on the 2021 session of the Disarmament Commission. The underlying issue prompting that decision does not belong to the First Committee and is being discussed elsewhere. More importantly, Australia is the only legitimate penholder with regard to the Disarmament Commission this year, given its status as outgoing Chair. We therefore cannot support a draft decision being submitted by another country, as it would create an unfortunate precedent.

Mrs. Nadeau (Canada) (*spoke in French*): I am taking the floor regarding draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, “2021 session of the Disarmament Commission”. We have fully assessed the merits of each of the two draft decisions on the work of the Disarmament Commission. Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49, “Disarmament Commission”, is sponsored by the most recent Chair of the Disarmament Commission, Australia, and is aimed at facilitating the Commission’s resumption of its work in 2021.

(*spoke in English*)

Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, however, is sponsored by one of the Commission’s many participating States and one that holds no office in the Commission. In addition, much of the draft concerns a bilateral concern of the sponsor that, while important, is an issue without direct relevance to the First Committee’s work on disarmament and international security or the work of the Commission. Consequently, Canada will vote against that draft decision.

Ms. Brandt (Netherlands): In addition to the explanation of vote delivered by the representative of Germany on behalf of the European Union, the Netherlands and Germany would like to add the following in their national capacity.

The Netherlands and Germany will vote against draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, as a whole, on the 2021 session of the Disarmament Commission, for the following reasons.

First and foremost, we are deeply concerned about the fact that draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, if adopted, would set an unwanted procedural precedent. In submitting this text, the Russian Federation, the sponsor of the draft decision, has not followed the long-standing practice according to which it is the former or

current Chairs of the disarmament bodies that submit draft decisions or resolutions pertaining to the work of those bodies. That has certainly been the case for the resolutions and decisions on the Disarmament Commission, as well as for the annual resolution on the Conference on Disarmament. As the most recent Chair of the Disarmament Commission, Australia, the sponsor of draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49, “Disarmament Commission”, should therefore have primacy when submitting a draft decision on it.

While the Russian Federation was aware that Australia would be submitting a technical decision on this issue, it took the opportunity to sidestep that practice for its own benefit. What the Russian Federation could have done — and what we consider normal practice — was to make suggestions to improve the draft, at an early stage and in a cooperative spirit. If any such suggestions had been acceptable, they would have been included. The First Committee is now confronted with two competing decisions on the same topic, creating the risk of both decisions being adopted, which would make for a serious implementation challenge and jeopardize the continuity of the Disarmament Commission. We therefore call on Member States to make a clear choice between the Russian initiative and the Australian draft decision. Voting in favour of both is not a responsible, viable or functional option.

Secondly, a number of proposals in draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48 relating to host-country issues pre-empt the course of action in another body, the Sixth Committee, which is mandated to deal with those issues.

Thirdly, the issuance of visas to representatives of Member States in accordance with the 1947 Headquarters Agreement is not an issue that falls within the specific mandate of the First Committee, which deals with matters of disarmament and international security. The issue should therefore be addressed in the appropriate entity, which is the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. Being United Nations host countries ourselves, the Netherlands and Germany will vote against draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48. We cannot support the procedure followed by the Russian Federation that led to the submission of the amendment and other arguments raised. This no vote does not necessarily indicate our substantive position on the paragraphs of the amendment.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.7, entitled

“Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.7 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Belarus. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.7.

The Chair: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.7. 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, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia,

Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Ukraine, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.7 was adopted by 170 votes to 3.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.11, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.11 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.11. Timor-Leste has also become a sponsor.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.11 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.16, entitled “Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.16 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors

of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/75/L.16.

The Chair: We will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.16. 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, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan,

Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

France, Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.16 was adopted by 169 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.20, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.20 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.20.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.20 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.37, entitled "Fortieth anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.37 was submitted on 9 October by the representatives of France and Germany. I will read the following statement in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.37, the General Assembly

"invites the Secretary-General to submit, in the context of the 2022 programme budget, a proposal for an increase in the subvention to the Institute."

In order to implement operative paragraph 8, the Secretary-General will include the following additional

resource requirements in the context of the proposed programme budget for 2022: (i) an amount of \$244,700 towards the costs of one additional professional post (P5) to represent the Institute, serve as certifying officer, report to the board in the absence and/or in the capacity of the Director and assist the Director in all management and administrative functions; (ii) an amount of \$39,700 towards the cost of quarterly briefings on research and ideas concerning relevant disarmament topics to all regional groupings and as further requested by Member States with a view to supporting the informed participation of all Member States in disarmament deliberations; and (iii) an amount of \$80,500 towards the cost of three events in countries that are not members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development to promote disarmament and non-proliferation knowledge, ideas and dialogue among a broader and more diverse community.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.37, additional resources in the amount of \$364,900 would be included in the proposed programme budget for 2022.

In respect of the preambular paragraph

“Noting the new financial and logistical difficulties that have arisen as a consequence of the introduction of rental costs for accommodation in the Palais des Nations”;

it should be noted that pursuant to General Assembly resolution 41/213, the rental charges for space occupied by tenants of United Nations premises are based on current commercial rates.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.37.

The Chair: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.37. I shall therefore put it to the vote first.

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, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, 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, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Colombia, Israel, Japan

Operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.37 was retained by 160 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.37, as a whole. 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, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, 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.1/75/L.37, 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 resolution A/C.1/75/L.40, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.40 was submitted on 9 October by the representative of Nepal. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.40. Kiribati has also become a sponsor.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.40 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, entitled "2021 session of the Disarmament Commission".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of the Russian Federation. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.48.

The Chair: Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the eighth, ninth, tenth and eleventh preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs (e) and (f) of draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Angola, Belarus, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mauritius, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Russian Federation, Senegal, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eswatini, Fiji, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

The eighth preambular paragraph of draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48 was rejected by 29 votes to 44, with 70 abstentions.

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

The Chair: I shall next put to the vote the ninth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Angola, Belarus, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mauritius, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Russian Federation, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic,

Tajikistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eswatini, Fiji, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Yemen

The ninth preambular paragraph of draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48 was rejected by 28 votes to 46, with 70 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall next put to the vote the tenth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Angola, Belarus, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Russian Federation, South Africa,

Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eswatini, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Yemen

The tenth preambular paragraph of draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48 was rejected by 23 votes to 46, with 72 abstentions.

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

The Chair: I shall next put to the vote the eleventh preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Angola, Belarus, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan,

Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Russian Federation, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eswatini, Fiji, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Yemen

The eleventh preambular paragraph of draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48 was rejected by 22 votes to 45, with 76 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall next put to the vote operative paragraph (c).

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Angola, Belarus, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan,

Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Russian Federation, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eswatini, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Yemen

Operative paragraph (e) of draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48 was rejected by 23 votes to 48, with 72 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall next put to the vote operative paragraph (f).

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Angola, Belarus, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran

(Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Russian Federation, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eswatini, Fiji, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen

Operative paragraph (f) of draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48 was rejected by 22 votes to 46, with 76 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, as a whole, as amended.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mauritius, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Russian Federation, Singapore, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Tonga, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cabo Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eswatini, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Palau, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Yemen

Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, as a whole, as amended, was rejected by 34 votes to 55, with 67 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Bangladesh informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote

in favour; the delegation of Iraq that it had intended to abstain.]

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49, entitled "Disarmament Commission".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of Australia. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/75/L.49.

The Chair: An amendment to draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49 has been submitted and is contained in document A/C.1/75/L.79. In accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee will first take action on the amendment. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Angola, Belarus, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kyrgyzstan, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador,

Egypt, El Salvador, Eswatini, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Yemen

The amendment to draft decision A/C.1/75/L.79 was rejected by 16 votes to 56, with 70 abstentions.

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

I give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to put this draft decision to a vote.

The Chair: In this case, I have to read out rule 128 of the rules of procedure:

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

The Chair: In keeping with this rule, we will proceed to adopt draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49.

Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.51, entitled “Report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.51 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of Belarus. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/75/L.51.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.51 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.57, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.57 was submitted on 14 October by the representative of Peru on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.57.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.57 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.69, entitled “Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.69 was submitted on 15 October by the representative of Angola on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Economic Community of West African States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.69.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.69 was adopted.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on delegations wishing to explain their position or vote after the voting.

Mr. Hassan (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): I have the honour to make this statement on behalf of the Group of Arab States to explain our abstention in the voting on

draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, entitled “2021 session of the Disarmament Commission”.

The Arab Group emphasizes that it fully understands the concerns expressed by certain delegations about the issues pertaining to the implementation of obligations under the 1947 Headquarters Agreement. The Arab Group once again urges for ensuring that the Headquarters Agreement is fully and honestly implemented and for enabling all delegations to take part in United Nations meetings on an equal footing and without discrimination. However, we insist on the importance of dealing with such concerns through the relevant United Nations bodies, foremost among them the Committee on Relations with the Host Country.

At the same time, the Arab Group emphasizes its keen interest in the continuing efforts of United Nations organs and bodies to address the important and urgent substantive issues on their agendas, especially those dealing with disarmament, which are increasingly important given the increased tensions we are seeing at the global and regional levels. In that connection, the Arab Group expresses its deep regret and concern that the Disarmament Commission has not been able to hold meetings in 2019 and 2020, not to mention the deadlock in the Conference on Disarmament. The Arab Group emphasizes the importance of completely safeguarding the United Nations disarmament machinery established at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Mr. Asokan (India): I am taking the floor to explain India’s vote on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48.

India attaches great importance to the Disarmament Commission, as part of the disarmament machinery triad and as a universal deliberative forum on disarmament issues. My delegation therefore considers it vital that the Commission function effectively, efficiently, objectively and inclusively. The Commission’s inability to hold substantive sessions for two successive years, in 2019 and 2020, certainly represents a lost opportunity for Member States to deliberate on crucial issues of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. It is regrettable that issues around the denial of visas to representatives of some Member States have not been resolved for the second year in a row. India firmly believes that actions that prevent countries from participating in United Nations meetings are very serious, as they affect the contribution that those countries can make to the United Nations. The effectiveness of the United

Nations disarmament machinery depends on the full and effective participation of all countries, which has been severely impaired by refusals to grant visas to representatives of some Member States. We sincerely hope that a solution will be found soon.

Nevertheless, it is incumbent on all Member States to ensure the continued effective functioning of the United Nations disarmament machinery, including the Disarmament Commission, especially at a time when it is already under strain. In view of the importance of the Commission’s unhindered functioning, India voted in favour of the draft decision because of its provisions calling for the timely convening of the Commission and for substantive progress to be made on the issues on its agenda.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): We want to reiterate our sincere solidarity with the delegations that have experienced problems in obtaining visas for their representatives to take part in meetings in New York. However, as we stated at the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly, we do not believe that it is appropriate for matters related to compliance with the Headquarters Agreement to be considered by the First Committee, much less for that discussion to be made a prerequisite to the start of a body’s work. Nor should First Committee draft resolutions be used to resolve issues that were not resolved in the Commission or that fall under the jurisdiction of another United Nations entity. Indeed, there are several external conditions that are affecting the work of the First Committee, as if to create further obstacles to delegations’ efforts.

Furthermore, we have to acknowledge that the entire disarmament machinery established by the final document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (A/S-10/2) is in institutional crisis. To the paralysis of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva we must now add the two consecutive years during which the Disarmament Commission has been unable to hold meetings. We need to review the disarmament machinery and, hopefully, revitalize it. While we can do this, the least the General Assembly could do is to express concern about the lack of substantive progress in the disarmament forums and set a procedural basis for the forums’ work. We do not believe that continuing to use language in the General Assembly resolutions on these forums that implies that everything is going well benefits the international community in general or the disarmament machinery

in particular. There should be a genuine evaluation of the situation, followed by the establishment of the basis for restoring the multilateral institutions needed to advance nuclear disarmament, an ongoing issue for the United Nations.

Mr. Situmorang (Indonesia): I am taking the floor to explain Indonesia's votes on some draft proposals under cluster 7.

As an important part of the United Nations disarmament machinery, the Disarmament Commission provides Member States with a level playing field for presenting their ideas, testing those ideas' attractiveness and building international acceptance on concepts and ideas in order to advance the cause of disarmament. Unfortunately, for a couple of years now, we have not been able to hold substantive sessions of the Commission to address important global problems related to disarmament. While acknowledging that the delegations of some States have not had access to the relevant meetings due to measures applied by the host country, we underscore the need to ensure the full, equal and meaningful participation of all States in the disarmament machinery. In that regard, we urge full compliance with the Headquarters Agreement. Indonesia fully sympathizes with the delegations concerned and has voiced its concern about the matter and will continue to do so on the relevant platforms of the Organization.

At the same time, the disarmament work contributes significantly to the implementation of Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations, a provision that we have all agreed on. We owe it to the peoples — our peoples — whom the Organization was established to serve to do that work. We need to pay these outstanding dues. Indonesia therefore urges all delegations to keep disarmament issues at the forefront of our deliberations, avoid politicization and work within our respective limitations.

In conclusion, our vote today should be construed as our full and impartial compliance with the Charter with a view to delivering substantive disarmament work by ensuring the proper functioning of the United Nations disarmament machinery.

Mr. Masmejean (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft decisions A/C.1/75/L.48, entitled "2021 session of the Disarmament Commission", and A/C.1/75/L.49, entitled "Disarmament Commission". Switzerland voted

against A/C.1/75/L.48 and in favour of A/C.1/75/L.49, based on the following considerations.

The First Committee has had a long-standing practice whereby the draft resolution on the Disarmament Commission is submitted by the body's current or outgoing Chair. The same applies to resolutions on many other disarmament bodies and processes, chief among them the Conference on Disarmament. In our view, it is vital to maintain that approach for reasons of predictability and the sustainability of the Committee's work. In recent years, the Committee has faced a growing number of competing draft resolutions on the same topic, and even counter-resolutions. That trend is harmful to the advancement of our work, and in view of that, Switzerland was unable to support draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48. The considerations I have just laid out also motivated my delegation's negative vote on the amendment to draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49. The proposed amendment would have fundamentally altered the content of the draft decision, thereby calling into question the role of the Chair of the Disarmament Commission in the preparation of the text submitted annually to the Committee.

Mr. Lynch (New Zealand): I am taking the floor to explain New Zealand's position on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.37, "Fortieth anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research" (UNIDIR), as well as draft decisions A/C.1/75/L.48 and A/C.1/75/L.49, regarding the Disarmament Commission.

New Zealand was pleased to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.37 and to join in celebrating 40 years of UNIDIR's work. Since its establishment in 1980, the Institute's work has been able to keep States, and the global community more generally, well informed on the disarmament and security challenges of today and, indeed, those that we will continue to confront tomorrow. It has spearheaded high-quality research and promoted creative thinking and dialogue. New Zealand has continued to contribute financially to UNIDIR in support of a range of its projects, and we encourage all States in a position to do so to do the same. We welcome the draft resolution's call for accommodation to be provided to UNIDIR in Geneva at a reduced rate. We also strongly support the proposal for an increase in the subvention to the Institute — something that in our view is well overdue — and we accordingly voted in favour on the separate vote on operative paragraph 8.

With regard to draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, my delegation is able to understand the frustrations underlying aspects of the text, notably with respect to the non-issuance of entry visas. Since we are aware, however, of the obligations pertaining to all Member States under the Headquarters Agreement, it is our continued hope that these issues can be satisfactorily resolved as soon as possible, including, as necessary, in the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, and without any impact on the Disarmament Commission itself or any requirement for the First Committee to consider competing draft decisions with regard to the convening of the Commission. New Zealand views the request in paragraph (e) of draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48 that the Secretary-General deal with various problems, including the issuance of entry visas to representatives of Member States, as particularly inappropriate. In contrast, draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49, the other one on the topic, submitted by the most recently elected Chair of the Disarmament Commission, is, as it should be, purely technical in nature. We hope that it will be able to provide a clear path forward for the Commission to resume its substantive meetings in 2021. For those reasons, New Zealand voted against draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48 and each of its separate paragraph votes and in favour of draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation dissociates itself from the consensus adoption of the procedural draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49, entitled “Disarmament Commission” and submitted by Australia. We objected to its adoption by consensus, and it is a pity that owing to problems with interpretation you did not heed our objection, Mr. Chair.

As we said in our earlier statement, draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, “2021 session of the Disarmament Commission”, which we submitted, was aimed not only at enabling the technical relaunch of the Commission but also at removing a number of political obstacles of principle to that process. We regret that our draft was not supported and that our constructive amendments to the Australian draft towards the same objective were also rejected. We think that Australia’s draft decision does not help to resolve the pressing problematic visa issue, which is impeding the Commission’s normal functioning and preventing some national delegations from participating fully in its work. We are grateful for the solidarity expressed by many delegations, but unfortunately we did not see that reflected in the vote.

The draft decision that was adopted was aimed against all of us. Given the deepening crisis in the functioning of the Commission, an important element of the triad of disarmament forums, the First Committee, with the support of Western States, is pretending that the problem does not exist and has been able to do nothing more than adopt Australia’s so-called technical draft decision. No good can come of such indifference to the work of the Commission.

Mr. Khaldi (Algeria): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain its abstention in the vote on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48, entitled “2021 session of the Disarmament Commission”.

Algeria’s stance on the visa issuance matter is in line with the position of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (NAM), as reflected in the final document of the eighteenth Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Baku on 25 and 26 October 2019. Indeed, the Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, including of my country, underlined the critical role of the countries that host United Nations Headquarters and offices in preserving multilateralism and facilitating multilateral diplomacy and intergovernmental processes for establishing norms. In accordance with their obligations under the relevant Headquarters Agreements and the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, all host countries were called on to facilitate the presence of Member States’ representatives at the relevant United Nations meetings. The Heads of State and Government also reiterated that political considerations should not interfere with the provision of the facilities required under the Headquarters Agreement enabling Member States to participate in United Nations activities. In that respect, we reiterate our call to the host country to fully comply with its obligations regarding the issuance of visas to representatives of Member States participating in such activities.

With regard to the draft decision under discussion, we sincerely believe that the Committee on Relations with the Host Country should conduct a comprehensive assessment to definitively resolve the problem of the host country’s issuance of visas, among other things. An action-oriented draft resolution in the General Assembly, as envisaged by the NAM member States, demanding the fulfilment of the host country’s responsibilities under the relevant Headquarters Agreement and the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, including through the timely issuance of

entry visas and the lifting of arbitrary restrictions on movement, could be a starting point for addressing the issue.

Finally, my delegation associates itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Group of Arab States.

Mr. Penaranda (Philippines): We abstained in the voting on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48 and voted in favour of draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49. Both deal with matters relating to the convening of the Disarmament Commission, and an outstanding issue surrounding them is the inclusion of certain paragraphs in draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48 on the issuance of visas to certain Commission participants that appear to prejudge the outcome of a process or processes to resolve the issue.

The Philippine delegation reiterates its view that the delegations concerned have a legitimate reason for raising the matter of the non-issuance of visas to certain representatives at the Commission, in view of the relevant provisions of the 1947 Headquarters Agreement. However, we note that visa issuance is a sovereign prerogative and that the matter should be resolved in the proper venue. Ultimately, the work of the Commission must proceed and should not be affected by a bilateral consular issue. The substantive issues that we have to address in the Commission are vitally important to the pursuit of the Commission's mandate to resolve issues of disarmament and international peace and security, including the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction. A solution is sorely needed at this point so that we do not sacrifice the conduct of the next session of the Commission, a solution that has yet to be found through the existing processes such as the work of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, the negotiations between the parties concerned and the good offices of the Secretary-General. If the issue cannot be addressed through those avenues, we should explore other avenues and exhaust all possible means agreed on by Member States.

Mr. Leopoldino (Brazil): I would like to explain Brazil's position on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.37. Brazil recognizes and supports the extremely important work done by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) in producing and disseminating knowledge on international security and disarmament. We also support its mission to assist Member States, the United Nations, the disarmament

policy community and other stakeholders in identifying and advancing ideas and practical actions to contribute to disarmament. Accordingly, Brazil voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.37, including in the separate vote on operative paragraph 8. However, in view of the well-known budgetary problems that many Member States are facing, Brazil believes that any increase in the grant to UNIDIR from the United Nations regular budget should be absorbed by matching reductions in other expenditures.

Mr. Mohd Nasir (Malaysia): Malaysia abstained in the voting on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.48 and voted in favour of draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49.

With regard to the visa-issuance matter, Malaysia has frequently expressed its sympathy and solidarity with all the delegations that have been affected. The full and effective participation of delegations in this Committee is vital and must be ensured. We fully respect the sovereign right of all countries to effective representation at the United Nations. It is therefore important for the matter to be properly addressed through the mandated platform within the United Nations, in accordance with international law, including the Charter of the United Nations, the 1947 Headquarters Agreement and the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations.

As my fellow delegations will recall, on the last day of the First Committee session last year, in November 2019, Malaysia urged all parties to strive to strengthen the First Committee and the effectiveness of its work (see A/C.1/74/PV.27). That is especially pertinent today, given our pressing and uncertain global geopolitical dynamics. As we will soon conclude the work of the First Committee for this year, let us set a goal for ourselves to convene a year from now — in the hope that the situation will improve and we can return to normal life — ready to continue productive engagement and constructive dialogue. For that to happen, we need collective efforts, readiness and willingness to preserve, protect and defend the disarmament machinery, including the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission, which belong to us all. The world can afford nothing less.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote on the items under cluster 7. I now give the floor to delegations wishing to speak in right of reply.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to react to a number of baseless

accusations made by some Western delegations about the Russian Federation in their explanations of vote on Russia's draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.64, entitled "Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements", during the Committee's meeting on 9 November (see A/C.1/75/PV.14).

In an attempt to shift the blame to Russia for Washington's steps aimed at dismantling the entire international arms-control, disarmament and non-proliferation legal architecture, our Western colleagues once again used what has become their traditional tactic of twisting and falsifying the facts. We all know, however, that the United States has unilaterally withdrawn from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems Treaty, the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty and the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. It is withdrawing from the Open Skies Treaty, has refused to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the adapted Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe and has declined to work on establishing a zone in the Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction. To this day Washington has still not discharged its obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention and has blocked negotiations on a legally binding protocol to the Biological Weapons Convention, and it continues to conduct joint nuclear missions with its NATO allies, in violation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The United States Administration has declared its intention to deploy weapons in space and use it as a theatre for military operations, which runs counter to the goal of preventing an arms race in outer space.

The United States has no right to judge other States' compliance with arms-control agreements. Every international agreement in this area has its own carefully formulated mechanism for monitoring and controlling compliance with its obligations. In some cases specialized international organizations have been established for the purpose. Washington's desire to assume the function of global arbiter unasked has no basis in international law and cannot be used as an argument for any inferences or conclusions, much less accusations, against sovereign States that are entitled to the same rights in international organizations as the United States itself.

Mr. Horne (Australia): I would like to react again to some of the comments by the Russian Federation and in particular to thank the membership for supporting

our efforts on this year's draft decision A/C.1/75/L.49, on the Disarmament Commission.

I probably see things quite differently from the Russian representative. What we heard is that there is a great deal of sympathy for the Russian delegation's situation, which other States are also experiencing, with regard to issues under the remit of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, notably visa issuance. However, what we have seen today and time and time again is a clear repudiation of the approach that is being taken. We are at a point now where we should all be reflecting somewhat on the direction we are taking, and I think it is clear — and should be clear to a number of delegations — that the path forward is one that involves everyone. Those who come here seeking to steamroll people and take over the work of the Committee completely are not rewarded. The message that I think we will be taking back to our capitals is that the high road is by far the better road. If we are to continue trying to produce something as we move into 2021, which will be an eventful year in our field, we should be working together and thinking beyond day-to-day wins, in-the-trenches discussions and procedural battles.

We should be thinking about how to embrace one another and move forward together.

This has been a particularly challenging year because we have not been able to be in the same room very much. We are very grateful to you, Mr. Chair, and to the Bureau and the secretariat, for your work in helping to piece together this session. But our message and our main reflection is that it is really time for us to start coming together. Consensus is a fragile and important thing. We treasure it and want to find it, and next year that will be even more important.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the representative of Australia, especially for his kind words addressed to the secretariat and the Bureau.

Mr. Knight (United States of America): I would like to echo Australia's plea for unity and collaboration. I would also like to very briefly respond to my Russian colleague's remarks. At several moments throughout this session of the First Committee, the room has shown the Russian Federation the level of its support for several of its commitments on arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament. That level of support was shown to be quite low on a number of important occasions throughout the session. I would simply suggest that

perhaps if the Russian Federation cared to fulfil its obligations and commitments on these vitally important issues and bring this Committee together each year, it might find itself in a more collaborative and cooperative environment with regard to those issues. We would very much like to pursue cooperation in such an environment.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I apologize for exercising the right of reply again, but I would like to briefly thank our Australian colleague for a reasonably constructive statement. We unquestionably share the goal of moving forward and we are ready to work towards that. However, there is one big difference between us. Has anyone from the Australian delegation been denied a visa to come to New York? I am sure that the answer is no, whereas this is something that has been a constant issue for the Russian Federation and other countries. That is essentially all that we wanted to point out, which is that we are not on a level playing field. We asked for solidarity and support. We heard it, and while unfortunately it was not reflected in the voting this time, I am sure that this will change in future.

In order to enable us to do our work properly, the host country should provide normal conditions and discharge all of its responsibilities under the relevant agreements. We ask for nothing more. It is a great pity that my American colleague avoided touching on that in his final statement. It would have been much simpler, and more elegant, to say that the United States will guarantee visas to all the representatives, in accordance with their obligations.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee has thus concluded action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under the agenda items allocated to it.

Agenda item 126

Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Programme of work

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): Our last order of business is to adopt the draft provisional programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2021, as contained in document A/C.1/75/CRP.5, which has been distributed to all delegations. As delegations are aware, the programme of work and timetable are being

considered under agenda item 126, "Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly".

The draft programme of work for 2021, as proposed by the Bureau, is based on the Committee's practices in previous years. The programme of work consists of one organizational meeting, which will take place on Thursday, 30 September 2021, eight meetings for the general debate, 12 meetings for the thematic discussion segment and six meetings for the action phase.

I would like to remind all delegations that the First Committee shares its conference facilities and other resources with the Fourth Committee. Consequently, the draft provisional programme of the First Committee for 2021, which we are considering now, has been prepared in consultation with the secretariat of the Fourth Committee. The two Committees will continue to coordinate their work and maintain a sequential pattern for the conduct of their meetings in order to make the most of their shared resources.

The provisional programme of work under consideration will, of course, be finalized and issued in its final form before the First Committee starts its substantive work at its next session.

May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft provisional programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2021, as contained in document A/C.1/75/CRP.5?

It was so decided.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee has now concluded its consideration of the last item on the agenda for today.

This year, owing to the limitations imposed by the global coronavirus disease pandemic, the Committee introduced several innovative arrangements to enable it to effectively contribute to the global agenda on disarmament and international security. The Committee held 15 in-person and three virtual meetings. Despite the challenges, a majority of Member States and observers participated in the general debate, which ended in a timely manner. However, the extremely high number of draft resolutions and decisions that were submitted to the Committee this year and the increased number of votes requested this session, as well as the cancellation of all in-person meetings at United Nations Headquarters during the week of 26 to 30 October, prolonged our completion of the action phase.

At this session, 143 delegations made statements during the general debate. During the action phase, the Committee adopted 71 draft resolutions and decisions, 41 of which were adopted by recorded vote, with 80 separate votes requested, including four draft proposals adopted without a vote as a whole. Thirty-one draft proposals were adopted without a vote, accounting for approximately 22.6 per cent of all action taken, compared to 32 per cent last year. Two draft proposals were rejected.

Before I adjourn this meeting and close the main part of the seventy-fifth session of the First Committee, I will give the floor to delegations who may wish to give final comments at this time.

Mr. Situmorang (Indonesia): My delegation would first like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chair, to express our appreciation to you and the Bureau members. You have steered the work of the Committee through the difficult and uncharted waters of this once-in-a-lifetime pandemic. Indonesia also commends the work of the Office for Disarmament Affairs, the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, the interpreters and all the other support staff.

Mr. Chair, we listened carefully to your explanation and figures about our deliberations, which warrant special attention given the direction in which the First Committee is heading. It is concerning that even during a difficult time that should be able to unite us, the pattern of our actions and interactions has shown otherwise. A significant amount of energy, including political leveraging, has been spent on competing proposals and procedural matters that are not directly related to or a high priority in our disarmament efforts, the very mandate of the Committee.

Before I go any further, let me underscore that we do not intend to play the blame game with any country or group of countries. We are rather calling on everyone to focus on the substance of our deliberations over their style, on the function of our work over its form and on the message over the messengers. We must resist the growing divisive simplification and dichotomization of our state of affairs. It is a fact that on the wide disarmament spectrum, we all belong to different interest groups and have complex relationships. For example, there are nuclear-weapon States, umbrella States and non-nuclear-weapon States; spacefaring and non-spacefaring nations; major producers, exporters and net importers of conventional weapons, and so forth.

The richness of the 193 members' positions cannot be captured simply through the three voting colours or even absences from votes. Instead, we should be more ambitious in our work and strive for consensus so that we can capture the gradations in their positions. While consensus should not be misused as a virtual veto, voting should be the last rather than the first resort for resolving our differences. It should not be our basic instinct or dominant way of decision-making. Voting is useful to understand the level of support on certain issues in our disarmament machinery.

Before concluding, I would like to reiterate the call we made at the beginning of this session of the First Committee to work together better, with a greater sense of collective responsibility and the desire to achieve the greater good that could result from the Committee's work (see A/C.1/75/PV.9). Indonesia is ready to work with all delegations to forge a consensus on future initiatives of the First Committee. We hope that we can use the time between now and the next session to find a way to achieve that ambition and deliver to "we the peoples" substantive work on international security and disarmament.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to make a final comment, first to thank you, Mr. Chair, and the Bureau for your work and for the professionalism with which you kept the delegations informed of the procedural decisions that had to be made in the extraordinary times we are living in. I would also like to thank all the delegations for their overall flexibility in working in these unprecedented circumstances, thereby demonstrating that we were able to work in spite of everything and move forward with the formal work of the Committee.

However, I want to express my delegation's concern about a very sad trend that we are witnessing in this Committee, which is that increasingly frequently we are leaving aside the negotiation, debate and consideration of issues and moving immediately to the consideration of the delegations or whoever submits a draft resolution, automatically admitting or discarding it depending on who submitted it, without considering its substance. Furthermore, the failure to consider the substance of the issues and the association of their substantive aspects with the actors submitting them prevents us from reaching the consensus that my delegation has repeatedly stated should be our aspiration and not a misunderstood rule impeding progress in the negotiations.

For that reason, and taking advantage of this opportunity, we would like to urge all delegations to value the type of work we are doing in the First Committee, which is what is at stake, and to continue striving for consensus — but on the basis of the substantive aspects — with a view to a calmer and more frank dialogue that can yield results. We will have another opportunity to do that next year, and with regard to other aspects, we will also have the opportunity to test whether this session of the First Committee helped us learn something or whether we will continue with business as usual, something that the Mexican delegation does not want. Many thanks again, and congratulations, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Mohd Nasir (Malaysia): I am taking the floor to briefly express my delegation's appreciation to you, Mr. Chair, the members of the Bureau, the secretariat, the Office for Disarmament Affairs, the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, the interpreters and others involved.

I note that the work of the First Committee has been a lot more composed and calm this year, as previous speakers have eloquently stated. That is first thanks to your leadership and guidance over the last few weeks, and secondly because we have all come to the meetings fully aware that we are living in very difficult, unprecedented times, which has made us psychologically aware that we cannot afford to conduct business as usual and need to exercise a heightened level of flexibility and cooperation. That is why, based on my general observation and in comparison to last year, we have tended to finish our work earlier and our deliberations have been much briefer and more straightforward. The lesson for me when I leave today is that we should reflect on the way forward for next year's session. Do we go back to the First Committee of 2018 and 2019, with numerous exchanges and rebuttals every day, or do we try to preserve the 2020 version, when we come in and conduct our business, showing restraint and the greatest possible cooperation and flexibility, because we know that there are major challenges out there? This year, it is the pandemic. Next year, there could be many other challenges that threaten us all. That is the lesson that I take from this year, and I hope we will reconvene in a spirit of sincere cooperation.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to make a few brief final remarks. When we began to prepare for the meetings of the First Committee, there was general pessimism. The exceptional situation arising

from the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic did not portend normal — or even an approximation of normal — working conditions. Everything was an obstacle, and the general suspicion was that, in this situation, the First Committee's work would become a quagmire that would worsen rather than reduce tensions, would not permit us to negotiate and would increase our disagreements instead of enabling us to advance little by little towards consensus.

Nevertheless, thanks to the work of the Bureau, and especially to the secretariat, the interpreters and the goodwill of every delegation, we have reached the end of the session with the adoption of the highest number of draft resolutions ever. We have made progress in the debate on many issues, we have at least managed to agree on what we disagree on in some draft resolutions and we have succeeded in keeping alive the hope that it is possible to move forward collectively in a rational way, putting an end to the danger of war. And that is very important amid the crisis and the COVID-19 pandemic, as we are all aware that we are facing a new arms race and new regional tensions that may lead to the danger of war and acts of armed violence to resolve them — based on the famous phrase that between equal rights, force decides. It was precisely to avoid that and to rationalize the management of conflict between equal and sovereign rights that the Charter of the United Nations Charter was written, and why it enshrines one of our most important moral and political imperatives — the call for universal disarmament under international control. It is that absolute imperative that justifies the prominence of the First Committee among all the vital efforts of the United Nations.

As the Committee may recall, in my opening statement (see A/C.1/75/PV.2), I referred to the message that we should send at the end of our meetings to the victims of weapons of mass destruction and nuclear weapons. Many victims are dying of old age, but others are unfortunately being added to that enormous bundle of suffering. The message that I believe we can send them is that we have fulfilled the mandate we were given, that we have done so to the best of our will and ability, trying to put our good faith and ability to negotiate first, and that though the road ahead is long, we have taken one more small step during this session of the First Committee and hope that those who succeed us will take the next steps. I am very grateful to all for their collaboration.

The main part of the seventy-fifth session of the First Committee is thus concluded. The Committee will reconvene sometime next year to elect its Chair and other members of the Bureau for the seventy-sixth

session, among other things. I encourage all to take care and look forward to seeing everyone again as soon as possible.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.